PRESENTED TO
WESTMAR COLLEGE LIBRARY
LE MARS, IOWA
BY
REV. FRANK ANDERSON

De Civitate Dei.

THE DIVINE ORDER

OF

HUMAN SOCIETY

BEING THE L. P. STONE LECTURES FOR 1891, DELIVERED IN PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BY

PROF. ROBERT ELLIS THOMPSON, S. T. D.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

PHILADELPHIA

JOHN D. WATTLES, PUBLISHER

1891

31
.T45

261
T49

Copyright, 1891,
by
JOHN D. WATTLES.

17576

PREFACE.

This book is made up of the eight lectures on Christian Sociology, I delivered, in February and March of the current year, on the "L. P. Stone Foundation" in Princeton Theological Seminary. In preparing them I had in view a larger audience than that which was to hear them. I have thought it best, in presenting them, not only to retain the lecture form, but to preserve in the text allusions to time and place, and to the class to which I was speaking. I may add that the kind reception of my lectures, by both faculty and students of the Seminary, has left with me some very agreeable memories of Princeton.

At several points I have added to what I had time to say within the bounds of an oral lecture. At others I have transposed what I did say into what seemed a better order. I am still conscious of defects of systematic completeness and arrange-

ment in the discussion; but I do not regard these as the qualities most necessary to its usefulness.

The reference on page 26 is to Mr. Edward J. Morris's very bright and suggestive book: "Prejudiced Inquiries, being the Backwoods Lecture for 1884" (Putnams).

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA,
May 26, 1891.

CONTENTS.

LECTURE I.

CHRISTIAN SOCIOLOGY 1

LECTURE II.

THE FAMILY: ITS NATURE AND ITS HISTORY 23

LECTURE III.

THE FAMILY: ITS RELATIONSHIPS, ITS SOCIAL PROBLEMS . 57

LECTURE IV.

THE NATION: ITS IDEA AND ITS DEVELOPMENT 87

LECTURE V.

THE NATION AND ITS PROBLEMS 123

LECTURE VI.

THE SCHOOL AND ITS PROBLEMS 159

LECTURE VII.

THE CHURCH: ITS IDEA, ITS UNITY, AND ITS WORSHIP . . 195

LECTURE VIII.

THE CHURCH: ITS SOCIAL PROBLEMS 231

INDEX 267

LECTURE I.

CHRISTIAN SOCIOLOGY.

In selecting the subject of these lectures I have been governed by my experience in intercourse with young candidates for the ministry, many of them my own students, and others who have been students in this Seminary. I have found them somewhat perplexed by the character of the problems thrust upon them by the life and the literature of our times.

A quarter of a century ago they might have confined themselves to the exposition of the Word of God, and to the questions of pure or applied theology which came directly in the line of a pastor's relation to his people. They now find that they are obliged to take some interest in a new range of subjects. Social agitations have arisen, which seem to go down to the roots of things. They are invited on Christian principles to repudiate the whole structure of society and to aid in its over-

throw. They find that passages of the Bible they never thought of in that connection are alleged as condemning what they had been taught to approve. They are told that Christianity is a revolutionary doctrine which lays the whole system of our social order under its ban, and that nothing but the unfaithfulness of the church to the direct teachings of its Founder can account for its acquiescence in the differences between rich and poor and other inequalities which characterize nominal Christendom. They are asked to contemplate the actual evils of society in the light of their Christian profession, and to say whether it is not their duty to aid in the establishment of a completely new order of things, which shall abolish social risks, insure the poor against the pressure of want, and control the productive forces and operations of society in a fashion which will contribute more directly and more equally to the benefit of all.

And besides the claims of this sweeping and revolutionary program, they find pressed upon their attention, in novel and urgent shapes, questions as to the family and its dissolution by legal divorce, the relations and frictions of capital and labor, the improvement of the homes and other conditions of the poor, the care of the dependent and the pauperized classes, the changes in our population through

the growth of great cities, the proper basis for public education, and other problems which seem to demand their attention as citizens, as Christians, and as ministers of the gospel.

It is not that these problems did not exist twenty-five years ago, nor that the Socialist solution of them is a novelty of our own times. It is that the intellectual atmosphere has changed completely. The formulas which once were regarded as furnishing a final solution of such problems for all educated men have been found inadequate. What we thought were prophecies have grown silent; what we reckoned as tongues of persuasion have ceased; what we accounted knowledge has vanished away. From nearly every chair of political and economic science are heard utterances which a quarter of a century ago would have been hailed with wrath and indignation; but they cause no outcry now. The educated man is no longer launched upon the world clad in a panoply of economic logic, which makes him indifferent to the schemes of theorists and the sufferings of the depressed classes.

At the same time the scientific drift of the age is causing us all to lay a greater stress, probably an excessive stress, on the effect of environment on every form of organic life, the spiritual equally with the natural, and to ascribe to the force of heredity

a potency all but omnipotent in the determination of character. These two watchwords of the Darwinian age—environment and heredity—are in all mouths. They have wrought themselves into the texture of our thinking. They have not only altered all social problems for us, but have given them an urgency which they never possessed for any previous generation.

I am far from regarding this change as an unmixed gain, still less do I regard it as an unmixed loss. I recognize our present intellectual condition as one of storm, in which the elements are seeking their level after a great disturbance. But

> Well roars the storm to him who hears
> A deeper voice across the storm ;

and across this storm I hear the voice of One who can bid the winds and the waves be still, but who will not do so until we have learned afresh the lesson of our dependence upon him. There is no peace for us but in becoming a more Christian nation, and discovering anew the pertinence of the Ten Words of Sinai and the Sermon of the Foundations to our social condition.

I trust you will not understand the announcement of these lectures to contain a promise of a complete and ready-made solution of all our social

problems. I aim at no more than to get you into the right attitude for appreciating them.

You may remember Norman Macleod's experience when, in visiting the people of his first parish, he called on the old Covenanter lady, who was very deaf. Beckoning him to a seat beside her, and putting up her ear-trumpet, she told him to "gang ower the fundamentals." That is just what I wish to do in these lectures. I ask you to consider with me the broad outlines of Christian sociology, so that we may come to those problems with a better appreciation of their significance and the bearings of solutions which have been proposed. I do so in the belief that a recurrence to first principles always is helpful to a wise handling of involved questions.

This discussion will have a double reference,—to the teachings of the Word of God, and to the problems of modern society. I need make no apology to anybody for beginning with the Bible. Nothing is more notable in modern sociological discussion than the constant reference to its teachings, and especially to those of its great central books, the four Gospels. Communist and Socialist seek their texts there. Reformers invoke its authority as never before. Especially in our own country, and through the rapid and wide diffusion of knowledge

of its contents, it has risen in importance as a recognized text-book of the profoundest principles that control human life.

The Bible is eminently a sociological book. If you ignore that fact, at once very much of it is remanded to a darkness which is feebly lit up by the lanterns of those who search for mystical senses and Messianic parallels or prophecies. To very many Christians much of the Bible means nothing, or next to nothing, because they have no perception of its sociological purpose. Until we perceive that the Hebrew nation is the type of all national life, and that its history is meant to illustrate the laws of that life, what shall we make of all this ado over kings and wars and revolutions? What else is the use of a great part of the Old Testament? Why is it included in the canon at all? The Old Testament is as truly the text-book of national life for all time as the New is the text-book of church life.

The Prophets especially are full of instruction on sociological problems. As Professor Seeley says, their utterances are "instinct with the sense of the national life, the national vocation, the continuity of the national history." Read what Mr. Mill says of their function in carrying the development of national life in Judea to a point never reached by

any other Oriental people, in dissociating the national religion from the blind conservatism which elsewhere stereotyped institutions, in making liberty and movement possible.[1]

And when we come to the New Testament we find the sociological element equally although differently prominent. The Baptist and our Lord both begin their mission by proclaiming, not a way of salvation for individuals, but a kingdom of heaven,—a new order of society, a holy and universal brotherhood transcending all national limitations, and embracing, or aiming to embrace, the whole family of man. It is the laws of that kingdom, the conditions of life within it, that our Lord sets forth in his chief discourses. It is the nature of that kingdom and its relation to that of Tiberius Cæsar which are mooted at his trial before the Roman procurator. It is for the establishment of a kingdom that he sends forth his apostles to bring the old world to an end and the new to its birth. Through all their labors, their

[1] See J. S. Mill's "On Representative Government." Also F. D. Maurice's "Prophets and Kings of the Old Testament" (London, 1871); and Sir Edward Strachey's "Jewish History and Politics in the Times of Sargon and Sennacherib" (London, 1874). Sir Edward Strachey discusses the subject from the standpoint of an English politician, and gets much light on the story from the "Memoirs of Barthold G. Niebuhr," the great German historian, which has been translated in an abridged form by Miss Winkworth.

preachings, their epistles, they are concerned with the relations of men within this kingdom, this "city that hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." And our canon closes with the vision of its coming down from heaven to earth, to permeate and pervade all the families, fellowships, and nations of men with its divine principles.

There never was an age more ready to take hold of the Bible on this side than our own is. We have come to the end of a great era of mere individualism in religion, in politics, in economics. John Wesley, Adam Smith, and Jean Jacques Rousseau were the prophets of that age, working on parallel lines for the same great end,—the recognition of the worth of the individual man as distinct from social bodies and corporations of whatever kind. That movement did vast good. It has left us a harvest of priceless results. But it always was an exaggeration,—a presentation of half a truth as though it were the whole truth. Like all exaggerations it has produced an equal reaction, and we now are in the rebound of the movement.

The social side of religion, of politics, of economics, is becoming the more prominent. We find men laboring again in very different fields and with no consciousness of a common end,—men like John Henry Newman, Karl Marx, and Otto von

Bismarck,—for the introduction of a new era. The present truth,—as our fathers called it,—the truth demanded by the needs and the cravings of to-day, is the proclamation of the kingdom of God,—the revelation of God to men in social relations and social duties,—the presence of God in the perplexities, the problems, even the convulsions, of society. I was much struck with what Professor Drummond and the other delegates from Edinburgh told us two years ago, when they came on their visit to our American universities to speak to us of the good which God had bestowed on their own University, that it might incite us to similar efforts. They said it was this truth of a divine kingdom, of religion as a thing of social relations, which had taken hold of the Edinburgh students. It was not a doctrine, nor a document, nor an emotion, but a new order of life, which met their deepest needs, and seemed to open the gate of a new existence to them.

So I believe the Master is forcing us to go back to the primitive gospel, the proclamation of a kingdom of heaven, of repentance as a preparation for it, of the new birth as the entrance into it. The *ordo salutis* which John Wesley learned from the Moravians and the Pietists of Germany, repentance and faith as an escape merely "from the wrath to

come," is being found too narrow, too individual, too spiritually selfish.

Men seek God to-day, not merely in his private disclosures to the isolated soul, but on the lines of social relationships and social ties. We catch this tone in the teaching which reaches and moves the great masses. It is a mark which distinguishes Mr. Moody's preaching from that of the earlier evangelists of our own country. It is heard more or less from all the pulpits, whose message reaches beyond the immediate congregation of the preacher, and helps to shape and mold the public opinion of the land. It is heard in the debates of our religious assemblies, our popular conventions, our ministers' meetings. It is the present-day truth, which holds the ear of the thoughtful classes.

Of course there is danger — nay, there is certainty — of exaggeration. We see that all around us already. We see it in the weaker brethren, who are carried most easily off their balance by popular tendencies of any kind, and who talk sometimes as though men were to be regenerated by clean homes and fresh air, or as if the gospel had been superseded by political economy. In this Darwinian age, when everything is made to depend on environment, it must needs be that such offenses come.

It is not the political economists on whom shall

fall the wo of bringing them. From them there rises a voice of general protest against attaching an exaggerated importance to changes in mere economic welfare. Such men as President Walker, President Andrews, Professor Laughlin, Colonel Wright, Professor Ely, in the present, and in the past my dear teachers Henry Carey and Stephen Colwell, join in the declaration that their own studies in the field of economic research have satisfied them that the spiritual lies deeper than the economic, that the first need of modern society is the diffusion of Christian principle, and that a right relation of man to God is the greatest fact of human environment.

Gentlemen, your proper work as ambassadors for God, pleading with men to be reconciled to him, is the greatest of social tasks. Nothing can compare with that in lasting importance. Only let that be done with a due regard to the work of Christ as the gatherer of our scattered humanity out of the isolation of sin into right human relations with each other. Preach the gospel, but preach no truncated gospel. Preach the Christ who died to save sinners; but preach him also as turning the hearts of the fathers to the children, of the ruled to the rulers, of the rich to the poor, and the poor to the rich, that he may gather into one grand fellow-

ship all that are in heaven and all that are upon the earth. "Watch what main currents draw the years," but remember, as Jean Paul Richter says, that it is not the spirit of the age to which you are to defer, but the Spirit of all ages, the Spirit of eternity. So shall you be doing the deepest and truest work for society, right in the line of the work done by your Master, and therefore for his glory.

In pleading for this recognition of a social side to the gospel, I am asking you to establish yourselves more firmly on the ground occupied by the Protestant Reformers generally, and especially by the founders of our Reformed Church. Calvinism in its heroic days was a social as well as a theological faith. It was theocratic to the core. And let us not misunderstand that word "theocratic." Theocracy, the rule of God in all human affairs, has been too often confounded with hierocracy, the rule of a priesthood or a clergy. No men ever hated hierocracy with more vehemence than did our fathers, because they regarded it as the great enemy of theocracy, the rule of God. It was their faith in his direct rule over all human spirits and all social relations, which made them the strong men they were, and weighted them—as Emerson says of them—with the weight of the universe.

The sovereignty of God was to them no mere

abstraction. It was the ground of all other sovereignty and of all authority. The divine will was the basis of all human relationship in family, state and church, as it was the basis of all righteousness in man and of all freedom in society. It was the calling and election of God which was drawing men into the life of affection in the Christian household, the life of righteousness in the Christian state, the life of human fellowship in the Christian church, out of a state utterly destitute of all good, a state of bondage to sin and darkness.

This manly, this heroic faith built men of heroic proportions and heroic achievements. Such were the men who made a conscience of their liberty, and who bore the brunt of the struggle for human freedom. Such were Gaspard de Coligny, William the Silent, Marnix de Sainte Aldegonde, the Regent Murray, Hampden and Cromwell, no less than John Calvin, Hugh Latimer, John Knox, and Johannes à Lasco. Theirs was a faith which produced mighty effects upon the life of nations; nay, of all Christendom, says Frederick Maurice. "Upon minds at once large and powerful," says The London Spectator, "it produced the grandest results by enabling them, as perhaps no other system has done, to lean with absolute and unhesitating faith on the divine will."

Eliminate from the Calvinistic theology the theocratic element, the recognition of the divine will as expressed to us in human relationships and in the good order of society, the acknowledgment of God as the unseen king of nations and churches, and you have destroyed the perspective and the coherence of its teachings. To do so is to obscure the glory of the unseen and righteous Sovereign, to whom the men of our heroic age rendered the homage of their whole lives, finding in him one who did not crush, but uplifted their spirits. For my own part, I shall never cease to thank God that my youth was cast in one of the smaller branches of our Presbyterian family, in which this theocratic idea was still a pervasive force, and the severance of our social life from Christian principles was rejected as a form of atheism. This, I think, is the service the Covenanters have been rendering to other Presbyterians, in spite of what we must regard as their caricature of the principle in many respects. They have been witnesses to the breadth of the divine kingdom,—the *amplitudo regni Dei*, as a sixteenth-century writer calls it.

I have found that Covenanter principle of the headship of Christ over all things to his people of inexpressible value in the study of social problems. Great would be my satisfaction if I could manage

to set it free from the narrow limitation which has made it a mere sectarian badge, and to place it before you as a common and precious inheritance of all Calvinists, nay, of all Christians. It is a principle which binds the Old Testament and the New together as closely as the binding joins them in our Bibles, and suggests how we may consecrate all our social life to God.

Sociology especially concerns itself with the three normal forms of society,—the family, the church, and the state. It recognizes the development of the nation out of the family, and of the church out of the nation. Sociology is a science of evolution. It was so long before Darwin made that theory popular, and narrowed its meaning for most people by associating it with the sciences of nature only. And, because it is an evolutionary science, it recognizes the existence of intermediate or transitional forms, of temporary importance mainly. Between the family and the state it finds the extended family or tribe, also called in Teutonic countries the mark, in others the commune, or the mir, or the village community. So between the nation and the church it finds the empire as a political form destitute of normal character and historical permanence, but of great sociological significance as pointing the way to the universal brotherhood of the church.

Christian sociology differs from the agnostic sociology of our own time, as natural science pursued in the spirit of an Asa Gray or a Principal Forbes differs from the same science in the hands of a materialist such as Professor Haeckel, or an agnostic such as Professor Huxley. It is therefore important to point out some of the marked differences in spirit and method which distinguish the higher from the lower sociology.

The lower sociology generally proceeds upon the assumption that progress is a universal fact, as it is the outcome of material laws, which work with unvarying uniformity. It might adopt the statement of Emerson, that man is always advancing, even on the scaffold, even in the brothel. On this ground it thinks itself warranted in accepting every stage of barbarism, every custom, however brutal and base, as landmarks in the past progress of the human species, and in constructing sociological history out of such materials.

The higher sociology denies that progress and civilization are the outcome of unvarying natural law. It believes in human freedom of choice to go upward or to go downward. It believes that to every people and in all stages of civilization there come days of trial and sifting,—crises which bring them to the parting of the ways. It holds that

while the choice of the nobler part enables a people to receive still higher things at the hands of God, the baser choice carries with it the loss of good to which they already had attained. It therefore accepts the fact of human and social degeneracy, while it believes in unbounded possibilities of social progress. Looking broadly over the condition of mankind, it declines to accept all the existing levels of moral condition as those through which the race has passed. It even declines to accept the savage as normal man in any sense.

From the word of revelation it learns that while the divine Logos has been shining into the hearts of all mankind, it is only those who have accepted and followed the light that have made real progress. And it believes that at the feet of every nation there yawn abysses of moral and spiritual ruin into which it may plunge itself, while above it rise heights of spiritual attainment grander than it has ever scaled.

Again, the higher sociology differs from the lower in its view of the forces which actually explain the world's movement. It does not seek the primal forces in the environment of man, but in the divine will moving in a holy order upon the face of society, and bringing forth unity, order, and human well-being. Much of what the materialistic sociologist

puts forward as the causes of institutions or of great social transformations it regards as their occasions only, and it looks beyond these historic circumstances to the first causes of things.

Not that it contemplates God as standing outside the world of humanity and operating upon its mass in a mechanical way. From Giovanni Battista Vico, a Christian sociologist, it has learned that the divine operation is in and through men in a dynamic way, and that the divine education or leading adapts itself to the nature of the human material, so that the divine-human operation rarely can be distinguished into its elements in our perception of it.

Not that it denies or disbelieves in that mode of divine operation which is distinctly recognized as supernatural.

The lower sociology tells us that just as the sum of the physical forces within our system is always the same, so of the social forces. Nothing in either case is either added or taken away, although there are constant rearrangements and fresh distributions which may be mistaken for increments of force. It is notable that this modern dogma has to be qualified by the words "within our system." It is not true of our own world. Our earth and every other planet of that system have been receiving a constant

influence of force from the sun, from the beginning of their existence. It is through the agency of this solar force that the once dead and inert matter of our planet has been drawn into shape of organic life and use and beauty. This solar force tingles in every nerve, and glows in every shade of color known to us.

So when we come to fix the bounds and limits of "our system" in sociology, is there no central sun for us to recognize as the source from which moral and spiritual force has been poured into our social environment, gathering men into the organic life of family, nation, and church, giving social life its colors of joy, its strength of use? Surely here we have one of the great unread parables by which God has been speaking to us, in natural things, of his relations to us, and of that fellowship we have with the Father of our spirits.

But the higher sociology goes farther still, for the parables of nature always fall short of expressing the reach and scope of the divine goodness. In the incarnation of the Son of God it recognizes the advent of a new force into the social world for its transformation into the family and the kingdom of God. And in the work of God's Spirit in the hearts of fallen men it finds abundant evidence that our human nature may be purified and ennobled, not

merely by the slow and infinitesimal changes of an educational character, but by a transformation so great that the comparison of it to a new creation or a new birth is so natural as to be inevitable. And it has faith in this power of regeneration, not only for members of households and nations which, to some degree, are pervaded by the Christian estimate of life and its possibilities, but for the lowest and the most degraded races of mankind.

All modern history is full of the evidence of an indwelling power of regeneration in Christian society. Dr. Draper, representing the lower sociology, finds no larger outlook for the nation than that which is suggested by the physical life of the individual man. It too must have its stages of infancy, growth, maturity, and decay, ending in social dissolution. This was true in some measure of the pre-Christian nations. Their social iniquities bore deadly fruits; the power of retrieval from an evil choice seemed wanting to them. But in the case of Christian nations a new moral order has been achieved. An earthly immortality has been bestowed on them; they can die only by wilful suicide. Even their sins can be retrieved by turning back to righteousness; and out of their worst winter can come forth a new spring-time of hope, a new harvest-time of righteousness. Modern his-

tory is not the grand series of funerals which Dr. Mulford says Dr. Draper leads us to look for. Our mother-land stands in the opening years of her second millennium with more of the freshness and vigor of youth than when Ælfred reigned in Winchester.

These contrasts of the higher with the lower sociology are enough to show the importance of clear views on these questions. This is one of the lines on which material skepticism is assailing the spiritual philosophy implied in our Christian faith. It is one of the insidious paths by which the feet of the unwary may be led from a positive Christian faith to a gradual skepticism, or at least an utter indifference to Christian teaching. The lower sociology has this tendency especially, and much of the harm it has done has been due to the absence of positive and distinct enunciation of Christian principle in this field, as in every other.

Here then is a section of the great battle-field, in which the contest between belief and unbelief is waging; and it certainly is that which has been most neglected by Christian apologists, and most abandoned to an insidious and aggressive enemy. We have seen the most anti-Christian views of the origin of the family and of the state enunciated with but little question or contradiction, where even

a slight impugnment of the Christian position on some other point would have called forth decided opposition. We have known men who were good Christians on every other point, who yet were state atheists.

And yet a Christian sociology is as important to us as any other part of our Christian philosophy. To rule God out of social development is to establish the absolute supremacy of the state over both church and family, to sanction the persecution of views held objectionable to state authority, and to suppress appeal to any higher law than the public opinion of the hour. It is indeed to exalt the spirit of the age to an absolute supremacy by denying the possibility of personal relation to the Spirit of all ages. It is to destroy our Christian liberty by elevating the will of the majority to absolute control. It is to resolve conscience into an evolution from non-moral forces, and to deprive it of right of protest against the society which is proclaimed as its creator, and therefore its master.

In fact, there is no line of attack upon the Christian position more insidious in its method and more disastrous in its practical results than this, and yet none on which Christians have been less active for either offense or defense.

LECTURE II.

THE FAMILY: ITS NATURE AND ITS HISTORY.

I presume that no one would think of denying that the family plays a great part in the Scripture history, and in the spiritual history of mankind. Even those who are disposed to rule out the nation from Christian sociology, as though that were a thing secular, profane, and worldly, will admit that the family has such intimate relations to the divine kingdom as make its consideration in this connection imperative.

The family has been best defined as *the institute of the affections.* It is that form of society in which the affectional nature of man obtains adequate recognition and finds scope for its development. Not, of course, that there are no affections other than those of the family circle. Always and everywhere the affections of friendship and patriotism have found recognition as a noble ornament of human nature.

In later stages of our ethical development the affection of philanthropy has become a powerful agent to secure the welfare of mankind. And above and beyond all the rest, love to God and friendship with him is the supreme affection of which our nature is capable. But the primary affections, and those through which friendship, patriotism, philanthropy, and even the love of God, are made possible to us through a wise discipline, are those which belong to the family circle,—the affection of the wife for the husband, the affection of parent for child, the affection of sister and brother for each other.

Let me also emphasize this term *institute* of the affections. It is rather a clumsy term, but it serves to indicate the important fact that the family is not created by the voluntary act of those who live in this relationship. We are born into it by no choice or volition of our own. It was given us, not made by us. And even those who found a new family are rightly said to enter into the marriage relation, not to constitute it between themselves. It is something which already exists for them with a well-defined character before they enter it. They do not confer first as to what kind of a relation they will establish. They find that already instituted for them, not only, or mainly, by the positive law of the land or the canons of the church, but by the creative

will of God, and thus established in the very nature of things. Thus our Lord goes behind the law even as given by the great lawgiver of the Jewish nation, and appeals to the idea of marriage, as it existed in the divine order, against the practice of divorce on other grounds than unfaithfulness.

Marriage in its idea is a relationship of complete mutual trust, of entire community of interest, of a new organic unity in which those who have been two halves are made one whole, so that each is under law to the other. Thus the two attain to that entire rounded life which is needed for their completeness, the strength of the man bound to the tenderness of the woman, and the insight of the woman supplementing the logical processes of the masculine understanding. Well does Arthur Helps say that if there were no other proof accessible to us of the divine love for our race, it would be evidenced sufficiently in the difference of mind and character which at once distinguish the sexes from each other, and make their association in family bonds the most delightful of human experiences.

But while this marriage relation is necessary to all of us as an ennobling social influence, not every one is called to enter into it. There are those whose vocation lies so clearly in a different direction, and whose peculiar work is so little consistent

with the duties and responsibilities of this relationship, that we are obliged to recognize that society would lose by their turning aside to this. Nor is society's gain from their singleness in life and in work compensated by any necessary loss to them, while they live and move in a social world to which tone is given by the purity, the joy, and the helpfulness, of true marriages. Nothing that they need for completeness of character is denied to them. They can live the fullest as well as the most useful lives,—at once nobly and as serving their generation. There is a false and injurious estimate of woman's social position, which pronounces that marriage is her only natural career. But which of us has not known noble women of whom this is manifestly untrue?

For this, and other reasons, it is well for either man or woman to wait for the call which will bid them to become husband or wife. As a bright writer of our days says, God brought Eve to Adam. Wait till he brings Eve to you. And he brought her after Adam was made and finished, not while he was still in the making. The virtue of waiting until the man or woman is fit to choose and to prize the gift God brings him, is not characteristic of American society, although it never will be missing from really strong characters. The principal

of a great school for girls once told me that directly in proportion to their development in firmness of character and their practical insight into life was the length of the interval between their graduation and her getting their wedding cards.

I am speaking, thus far, of and to persons of at least ordinary discretion. But what shall we say of the foolish marriages between persons who have little more than a ball-room acquaintance, and that measured only by months, or even days? Is it wonderful that marriages thus begun end so often in the divorce court? It would not be unwise or unfair if the state were to require every marriage license to be taken out not less than three months before it was needed, as a "declaration of intentions" which would prevent hasty and ill-considered unions of persons who know nothing of their fitness to make each other happy.

On the other hand, we must not forget that even the best marriages are not unattended with a certain amount of disparity in tastes and temper, which time and wisdom are needed to overcome. As Theodore Parker says, "It takes years to marry completely two hearts, even of the most loving and well assorted." It is so because young people of opposite temperament are likely most to attract each other before marriage, and then to require the

most of mutual toleration and gradual adaptation afterward. And, as Mr. Parker says, "The man will be nobler and larger for being associated with so much humanity unlike himself; and she will be a nobler woman for having beside her manhood that seeks to correct her deficiencies, and supply her with what she lacks, if the diversity be not too great, and there be real piety and love in their hearts to begin with." It is evidence how profound the union which true marriage produces, that with the lapse of years husband and wife often come to resemble each other, not only in disposition and temper of mind, but even externally in face and features.

That the marriage relation, and with it the family, has undergone a process of development, is recognized by our Lord when he says that Moses, on account of the hardness of their hearts, allowed them to put away their wives for a less fault than the gravest breach of the marriage covenant. And by "hardness of heart" the Scriptures never mean obliquity of the moral nature. In Bible usage, "heart" stands not for the affectional, but for the intellectual, side of the mind. "Hardness of heart" means simply stupidity.

Christ appealed to the primal order of human life, in its state of innocence, as a condition in which

permanent monogamic marriage was the only relation of the sexes. This statement has been challenged by some representatives of the lower sociology, who declare that the monogamic family is not primitive, but has been the outcome of a social development extending over indefinite ages. It is alleged by McLennan, Morgan, and Lubbock, that promiscuous intercourse of the sexes furnishes the starting-point in the development of their relations. From this mankind are supposed to have emerged by the adoption of polygamy either in its polyandrous or its polygynous form.

The evidence for these statements is the fact that promiscuity and polygamy are still found among the lower races of mankind, and it is taken for granted that the lowest condition in which we find men must represent the earliest known stage in the general development of the race.

This assumes what even sociologists of no Christian prepossessions are beginning to deny, that progress is a fact without exceptions,—that in fact there neither has been, nor can be, any such thing as degeneracy of a whole people or race. But the evidence is against that assumption in this case especially. If it were true, the alleged evolution of man out of lower forms of animal life would not have stood for a progress, but a retrogression. The

higher species of both bird and animal life have advanced beyond this stage of the relations of the sexes, most of them pairing off for the year, some of them in life-long unions. Coleridge well speaks of "the home-building, wedded and divorceless swallow," as a foreshadowing of man himself. Are we to believe that primitive man stood on a lower social level than the tiny bird, whom David, in exile, envied its place in the house of God?

The evidence upon which this assumption against monogamy is based is not satisfactory even to such thinkers as Charles Darwin and Herbert Spencer, both of whom assume monogamy as the starting-point. And while both forms of polygamy are found in lower stages of civilization, they never are present as forms which are intended to set aside and supersede monogamy. In fact, the general balance of the two sexes in point of numbers must forbid that. Polygamy in most cases has been the accompaniment of an excessive measure of wealth or power in the hands of a few persons.[1]

It has been within the monogamic family that progress has been achieved in bringing marriage back to its primal nobility and purity as the in-

[1] See on this point, and on the history of the family generally, "The Family: An Historical and Social Study." By Rev. and Mrs. Charles F. Thwing. Boston. 1887.

stitute of the affections. In the first stages of the history of civilization the greatest demand was for masculine energy and force, and woman was honored in so far as she laid aside the more feminine qualities of tenderness and patience, and clothed herself with those of men.

In the Jewish history, as our Lord notices, we must distinguish between the ideal which was before the mind of the legislator, and which is set forth in the story of the first family, and the actual legislation, which permits what the low state of culture made inevitable. The former regarded permanent and monogamous marriage as the divine order. The latter recognized the fact that the ideas the Hebrews had in common with other peoples could not be ignored, although the law might be so shaped as to give it an educational character. So polygamy was allowed and yet discouraged; divorce was conceded rather than enacted.

As time proceeded, the law did an educational work in both directions, which was reinforced by other agencies of spiritual enlightenment. After the Exile we hear nothing of polygamy in either the Old Testament or the Apocrypha, but find allusions to its continued existence in the Talmud and the New Testament. Thus Herod the Great had seven wives at once, and it seems not to have

been forbidden among the Jews until the eleventh century. As regards divorce, also, there was the growth of a better mind among the Jews. While the school of Hillel asserted the right of the husband to put away his wife for any fault that was offensive to him and tended to disturb the family peace, that of Shammai approached our Lord's strictness by confining the just causes to moral delinquency and unchaste behavior.[1]

Altogether, the position of woman among the Jews was higher than in any other Oriental people of their time. She was enclosed in no harem, hidden behind no veil, refused no respect. Yet she was treated everywhere as a being strictly inferior to man, and in the status rather of a child than of an adult person. And the women who acquired a great name were those who stepped outside the beaten track of feminine duty to play the part of men, as did Deborah, Huldah, Abigail. It is notable that such women belong only to the earlier period of the history. The growing intercourse with the nations roundabout seems to have affected her position unfavorably in later times. But she always was kept in subordination and treated as the ser-

[1] See "The Jewish Law of Marriage and Divorce in Ancient and Modern Times, and its Relation to the Law of the State," by Rev. Dr. M. Mielziner. Cincinnati. 1884.

vant of her husband. The finest picture of the good woman in the Bible is not of Hebraic but of Edomite origin, being found in the proverbs king Lemuel's mother taught him; and while the nobler traits are not wanting to it, it is the house-thrift of the good wife which chiefly occupies the poet's attention.

The family generally held a very high place in the Jewish order. It was by virtue of his membership in an Israelitish family that the Jew held his place in the theocracy, and the principle that the family is the unit of the state was fully anticipated. Each family was a self-contained organism, and the land laws secured its perpetuity by furnishing it with an endowment which could not be alienated permanently. The male children were sealed as God's by the sacrament of circumcision, and their education in the faith of Israel was incumbent upon every parent. Before the erection of the synagogue the family home must have been the focus of religious teaching and worship, as was the case with all the nations of antiquity,—a fact of which we have glimpses in the Book of Judges.

On the other hand, there was no such *patria potestas* in Judea as in Rome and Greece. The son could not be slain or enslaved by his father, even when still a new-born infant. The power to inflict

severe penalties was reserved to the magistrates, because the son was God's property, and not merely a chattel of the family possessions.

In later Jewish life we find evidence of the intensity of family feeling, especially of that love of parents for their children to which our Lord appealed in the fifteenth chapter of Luke and elsewhere. It has become all the more intense through the influence of law and of public opinion in the restriction of Jewish divorce in Christian countries. The picture drawn of it in "Daniel Deronda" is eminently true. This is one of the precious things of the Old Covenant the Jew has never lost. Yet it is in the worship of the modern synagogue that the Jew thanks his Maker,—"that thou didst not create me a heathen, a slave, a woman!"

In some important respects Moslem society is cognate to Jewish. In the matter of woman's position it ranks far below it. While within Judaism the social and moral progress of the nation had the effect of exterminating the practice of polygamy, so that it rarely is mentioned in the Scriptures after the Exile, it was the Moslem prophet who actually established this practice in Arabia, or at least gave the highest sanction he could to a usage which probably was as rare and as little respected as in any other land in that age. He certainly deprived

the Arab woman of the measure of freedom and equality she had enjoyed, commanded her to veil her face in public, and remanded her to the gilded prison of the harem.

Through all ages of Moslem history the foot of the Prophet has been on the neck of woman, and that for a deeper reason than his own gross sensuality. Islam is the most exclusively masculine of religions. Mohammed did not teach that women have no souls, but he might as well have done so as establish a religious system which offers no scope to their affections, which in effect is nothing but a bundle of intellectual beliefs and external duties. It is a faith for a drilled army, not for women.

It is true that by the great mystical reaction called Sufism woman has made a place for herself within Islam, but that reaction is a perversion of the primitive creed. And even now Moslem women take little part or interest in religion. They seldom are seen in the mosks, and they are not wanted there. On the other hand, to Mohammed is due honor for suppressing the practice of infanticide, not only among the Arabs, but among all the peoples who have embraced Islam.

In the West, Christianity came into contact with the classic (Greek and Roman) world and with our Teutonic forefathers. In the classic world the

family was deprived of its true scope by the predominance of mere authority and the subordination of the affections. Neither Greece nor Rome gave womanliness honor beside manliness. It was the latter which ranked as virtue in Latin, as soldierliness did in Greek. The Athenian woman whose name never was heard outside her husband's house was held the most worthy of honor. Only the class of women represented by Lais were educated to the point of conversing intelligently with men. In Sparta, honor was given only those who put off their natural tenderness and became soldiers in spirit. *'Η ταν ἢ ἐπὶ ταν*,—"Bring back this or come back on this," were the words with which the Spartan mother addressed her son, as she handed him his shield before he went forth to battle. When news came to Sparta of a great defeat, those women whose husbands, brothers, and sons had escaped death by retreat, put on mourning, while those whose relatives had fallen put on garlands and went to the temples to thank the gods.

The Roman spirit was much the same. The Roman matrons were honored highly, but only as being pervaded by patriotic spirit and devotion to the ends of the state,—as when they poured their ornaments of gold into the public treasury for the defense of the republic, or sent out their husbands

and sons gladly to endure wounds and death in its wars. To such women men gave place in the narrow streets of the imperial city; nothing indecent might be said or done in their presence; their testimony had equal weight, in the courts, with that of men, but they could not be compelled to give it. Savigny declares that "among no people of the old world were wives so highly honored as in Rome," and quotes from Columella, a writer on farming who lived in the first century of our era, a description of the home life of the old Romans: "There was then the highest reverence, joined with concord and with industry. There was no division of interests to be seen in the house, nothing that the husband or the wife claimed to belong to either of their own right. All was looked upon as common to both."

But there is a darker side to the picture. The Roman family was based on the *patria potestas*, or lordship of the head of the family, which embraced the power to sell wife or child into slavery, and to inflict on them death itself. This stretch of power is one of the most peculiar features of Roman civilization; it is connected with many of the stories which display the character of the people, as an orderly, law-obeying, and law-giving race. It shows that the legal temper of the Romans, and the *severitas* on which they prided themselves, thor-

oughly penetrated the Roman family, converting it into a miniature of the republic, or into a copy of the severe and orderly life of the old Roman gods before Greek tales corrupted their religion. So long as it was found tolerable, it was a source of social strength, and confirms Niebuhr's saying to Savigny that the Romans were great while they believed in their national religion, which was "a religion of the strictest veracity, fidelity, and honesty."

But with the growth of a true conception of the worth of the individual, this sacrifice of individuals to the corporate family became impossible, and none rebelled more decidedly than did the Roman women in the era following the Punic wars. Failing to obtain an alteration of the laws, they simply evaded them. They refused to be married by any of the ancient forms, through which the wife passed under the power (*in manum*) of her husband. They substituted marriage by simple contract, which might be revoked by either party; and they evaded the rule by which the wife became her husband's property if found among his possessions (*in bonis*) for a year and a day, by returning to their fathers' homes for three days of each year.

The consequence was a dissolution of social ties such as has never been seen in any other country

laying any claim to civilization. Divorce became almost the rule, and women (it is said) ceased to measure their lives by the number of their years, and substituted that of their marriages. But the matron whom Jerome describes as attending the funeral of her twenty-fourth husband must have got even beyond that. And with the dissolution of the family everything was lost. Decency, chastity, loyalty, faith, honor, all perished in the same abyss; and the world trembled on the edge of the black pit of atheism, as never before or since.

Roman historians and satirists joined the better men among the rulers in seeking to stem the evil tide, but in vain. Tacitus pointed to the chaste marriages and the honored women of the Germans of Northern Europe in the hope of shaming his countrymen. Our fathers, by the grace of God, even before they heard the gospel, had the virtues of chastity and loyalty which are fundamental to the marriage state. Even after the Roman world had accepted Christianity as its established faith, we find Salvianus of Marseilles pointing the nominal Christians of his age to the Teutonic pagans as exemplars to them in this respect.

When we come to study more closely the condition of these old Teutons as their own records present it, we find that the position of woman among

them was much the same as in Sparta and early Rome. They were honored for unwomanliness more than for womanliness. Their heroism was that of inflicting rather than enduring pain; and the most notable women of the old sagas were those whose fierce tongues and bitter resentments stirred men to mad acts, and awakened or kept alive family feuds which lasted for ages. Here and there we find an exception to this, as in the queenly and housewifely mother of Olaf, king and saint; but even she sends forth her son on Viking voyages to lay waste the homes and plunder the property of those whose sole offense was their possessions.

And among our pagan forefathers, as among the Greeks and Romans, and, indeed, all pagan peoples, the practice of infanticide was sanctioned by usage and permitted by law. When the new-born child was taken to its Roman father, if he took it in his arms, this signified his purpose to have it brought up. If he but turned his back on it, it was exposed to death without a word spoken. Its only chance of escape was to fall into the hands of wretches who brought up these abandoned children as slaves, and the girls for a fate even worse. The destruction of a sickly or a malformed child was regarded as a duty, especially among the beauty-worshiping Greeks. Among our forefathers there was much

discontent when the Christian law forbade them to destroy their new-born children; they declared they could not afford to bring up every girl that might be born to them!

In China the practice is in full vogue, and one order of Roman Catholic nuns has saved thousands of exposed children in and around Canton alone. It is said the wives of the missionaries always shun one of the roads out of the city of Shanghai. On that road stand two great porcelain towers, erected for this slaughter of the innocents.

It was into this Jewish, Græco-Roman and Teutonic world that the gospel came to create the Christian home; that is, to recall the home life to its primitive ideal of tender affection, lofty purity, and loving obedience to a loving authority, and to secure all these by making marriage a permanent, life-long relationship. Christ raised the woman to her rightful place as man's equal, not by decreeing that her subjection should cease, but by disclosing God to men in his true character, and by making our relation to God one of affection as well as of law. He blessed woman's condition in his Beatitudes. He gave scope for woman's powers in his every command. He presented the gospel as at once so masculine in its strength and so feminine in its tenderness that the equality of the two sexes

in the highest matters must be recognized at once, and woman's worth in all lesser would obtain recognition sooner or later.

Hence, as the Apostle says, there is in the Christian dispensation neither male nor female. Hence our Lord's relation to the women of the Gospels, which my friend Dr. Henry C. McCook has so well discussed in a recent volume of sermons. No woman was his enemy; none ever helped his enemies to set a trap for him; none ever lifted her voice except to bless him or mourn for him. From his cradle to his ascension women were with him as his loving friends,—"last by the cross, first by the tomb." They "ministered unto him of their substance," the first Woman's Board of Missions furnishing the means by which he and his apostles were enabled to give themselves to their ministry. The only bad women of the gospel story are the two who never came within the touch of his influence,—Herodias and her daughter.

Thus Christ indirectly solved the problem of the family. The Christian woman who entered the family as wife and mother had her position assured to her, just in so far as society at large and her husband in particular were pervaded by his spirit. His most positive command guarded her against the arbitrary divorce which everywhere prevailed.

His revelation of "the Father, from whom every family in heaven and earth is named," furnished a new ground for all social relations on earth as well as spread a new heaven above men's heads. His elevation of meekness, patience, and forgivingness to the rank of primary virtues in the kingdom, gave a new law of life to the Christian household.

And in this spirit his apostles, in their epistles to the churches, developed in detail the idea of Christian family life. The glimpses we get of such Christian households as that of Aquila and Priscilla, with whom the Apostle lived a year and a half in Corinth, and whose heads he greets as "my helpers in Christ Jesus," show us a new thing under the sun,—a family life in which courtesy and mutual consideration permeated all relations. Well might the Apostle feel that if the gospel would do but this for all the families of the earth, it was worth all the sacrifices demanded for its propagation. To the women of the Gospels we add the women of the Epistles,—the long and honored series of home-mothers, welcoming the saints with the warmest hospitality, training their children and grandchildren in the knowledge of the Scriptures, and exemplifying Christian womanhood in works of mercy and words of comfort.

So in the direct teachings of the apostles on

household relations, which are among the most neglected texts so far as pulpit use goes. They are infused with the spirit of Christ and his gospel. They recognize still that subordination to the father's and husband's authority which is the truth of the Old Testament. But they require a transformation of authority into something more gracious and winning than the law could know of. They lay it under bonds to love. "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ loved the church, and gave himself up for it." "Husbands, love your wives, and be not bitter against them." "Parents, provoke not your children to wrath." These are the keynotes of a new life in a new world. It is not surprising that, although polygamy still existed among the Jews, and was expressly prohibited only to the bishops of the churches, it at once disappeared among Christians. A right sense of the fitness of things made that impossible which was inconsistent with the self-respect of the Christian wife, and which would have made the proper training of the children impossible.

Especially is the marriage relation elevated to the highest honor by the declaration that it corresponds to the relation of Christ to his Church, and that it thus has its divine ground in that relationship. Already this was foreshadowed in the Prophets,

when Judea was spoken of as a land wedded to the Lord. In the apostolic epistles the Church is set forth as the bride of Christ, and human marriages as holy because they correspond to that relation. The human husband is to love his human bride as Christ loved the Church; to give himself up for her as Christ gave himself up for the Church. The human bride is to be subject to a loving and helpful authority in her husband, such as Christ exercises over the Church. Thus the relation is carried up to the highest level of self-sacrificing love. It is no longer a giving proportioned to getting, but a giving without reference to getting. It is forsaking husband and wife and child, in one sense, because we give them up as regards the selfish basis on which we have placed our relations to them. But it is getting them back a thousand fold, even in this present life, because the new and unselfish love in which we embrace them, when we love them in Christ and for his sake, makes them a thousand-fold more to us than they ever were before.

Let me not be misunderstood here. The spiritual relations of family love have been so distorted and travestied by Roman Catholic and many Protestant writers, that any reference to the matter is liable to misinterpretation.

The Scriptures never set forth Christ as sustain-

ing this relation to individuals, but only to his church collectively. They never present the spiritual relation as the rival of the human, but the reverse. There are no "brides of Christ" in the New Testament; only "the Bride of Christ." And when the Gospel speaks of getting back wife and child, husband and father, though giving them up for Christ's sake, it means the reconstitution of our relations to them on a more real, more human, more tender basis, and not on any fantastic basis called "spiritual." It means that we never shall love any human being that God has given us to love as he means us to love them, and as they deserve to be loved, until we love them as Christ loved his Church, unselfishly, and to the surrender of our lives for their sake. The divine love set forth in that great sacrifice is not the rival, but the quickener and the sustainer, of all true human affection.

Such was the new ideal of the family life and of the new ideal of the marriage relation which Christ directly and through his apostles gave to the world. To a certain extent it became at once effective in the ranks of the believers in his name. The Christian community became notable for the permanence and the purity of their marriage relations, for the honor accorded to good women, and for the warmth of unselfish affection which per-

vaded their family life as well as their churches. It comes out in incidental touches in their martyrologies, and in what we read of the relations of great Christians to their mothers, their wives and their sisters. Woman was especially honored as suffering for the name of Christ, who had done so much for her sex as well as for her race. It was the boast of the Church that she had more heroines to show than Rome could enumerate heroes. The names of Agatha, Agnes, Blandina, Cæcilia, Felicitas, Paulina, Perpetua, and a long array of others, stand in places of honor on the roll of martyrdom. Charles Kingsley in his "St. Maura" has reproduced for us the story of a Christian wife dying on the cross beside her husband, and overcoming her natural weakness so as to rejoice in sharing his sufferings and those of their common Master.

But there was much in the circumstances of the early Church to unfit it to take in the whole scope of our Lord's teaching on the subject. It was, as we have said, an age of terrible dissoluteness. The world seemed to lie wallowing in wickedness, and, as time went on, the disposition grew to mark the inward severance of the Christian from it by outward signs and visible protests. A great value was laid on celibacy, and women were stigmatized as an element of temptation and seduction, rather than

co-workers in the cause of purity. Church writers began to speak of them in terms of most un-Christian contempt, of marriage as a concession to human frailty which none could enter and hope for perfection, and of the parental relation as a burden on the spiritual energies.

Augustine went so far as to suggest that it would be a fine thing if the race as a race were to commit suicide by a universal celibacy. And after the fourth century, in all quarters of the Christian world we find husband and wives renouncing each other to betake themselves to a monastic life, and to become "married to the heavenly Bridegroom."

The truth is that the Church was not spiritually strong enough to overcome the influence of an adverse and anti-Christian environment. It was partly the public opinion of a corrupt society, which had learned to disbelieve in the purity of relations it had trampled under foot. Nothing is more certain as a punishment of licentiousness than the cynicism which makes faith in purity impossible. Partly it was the influence of a false philosophy which crept in through the heretical sects of Gnostics and Manichæans, but pervaded in some measure the thinking even of those who combated their influence. In this philosophy the material world and the bodily nature of man were treated as

the source of evil, and the emancipation of the spirit from them was held forth as the great redemption.

In conformity with these ideas the language of the New Testament concerning the flesh—the baser, self-indulgent, disorderly nature in each of us—was construed to apply to the body; and asceticism, denial of natural desires of every kind, was held forth as the path of purification and union to the divine. Hence the sudden rise and rapid spread of monasticism, with its vows of renunciation of our own will to obedience to a spiritual father, of renunciation of property and of the family life, and its perpetual self-mortification, a daily dying, not for others, but simply to save one's own soul. These evil and unnatural traditions still perpetuate themselves, not only in the traditions of the Greek and Latin churches, but in the thoughts and practices of many who are classed as Protestants.

The Latin Church went beyond the Greek, with that practical logic which characterizes the Western mind. To avert the threatened danger of a hereditary clergy, which was especially threatening at the time when the feudal system was passing from a life to a hereditary tenure of benefices, the papacy enacted the celibacy of the clergy, and violently severed the marriage relation in the case of married priests and bishops.

The danger was a real one, but the remedy was one of fearful cost. It affixed a visible stigma to the married state. It taught the laity to despise as of inferior worth the ties in which God had bound them to their parents, their wives, their children. It sundered the priesthood from the people and organized them as a separate class. It denied them participation in the relations which made up so much the lives of their people, and thus made their direction of those lives unreal and fantastic. It tended to eliminate from society the purest, most earnest and noblest families, by providing that not they but the less noble should be represented in posterity. Thus of the French Arnaulds all but one embraced the monastic state, so that all later Arnaulds are his descendants, and he a scapegrace. The survival of the morally unfittest was provided for.

Instead of elevating society to a higher level, the celibacy of priests, nuns, and monks—as all authorities show—helped to drag it down. What was to be a grand uplifting force to bring mankind nearer to God, actually became a dead weight on the moral energies of the race. I appreciate fully the moral and spiritual beauty of characters like Francis of Assisi, Catherine of Sienna, Birgitta of Sweden, Thomas à Kempis, and other representa-

tives of the monastic life. I even agree with George MacDonald that a perfect monk would be a very fine thing in his way, but far inferior to a perfect man. And with Charlotte Brontë and Thackeray I thank God for Martin Luther, who set us free of it.

The Christian ideal of woman, on the other hand, began to take root among the laity, and bore fruit in chivalry. The gentle perfect knight, who gives up his life to defending the weak, righting all wrongs, and especially championing woman against her oppressors, was a noble ideal, which not even the painful ribaldry of Cervantes has managed to make quite ridiculous.

But the knight's relation to womanhood was affected injuriously and made fantastic by the monastic spirit of the times. The mistress to whose service the knight gave his life, or the poet consecrated his verses, must in no case be his wife. "Familiarity breeds contempt," they said,—which means that inside the family life there could be no place for those lofty emotions and unselfish aspirations which were the essence of chivalry. So Dante writes only of Beatrice, whom he saw but twice in his life. Petrarca sings only to Laura, of whom he knew little more. Gottfried of Strasburg races all over Europe at the bidding of a lady to

whom he was as good as a stranger. And all three were married men. Edmund Spenser is the first great poet who finds his mistress in his own honored wife.

The chivalrous ideal first struck root in Teutonic soil, where monasticism always was an exotic. In that same region there came a great upheaval for the overthrow of the fantastic and artificial system of the Latin Church, and for the rehabilitation of the natural relations which God has created and Christ has blessed. To restore the family and the state to their rightful place in the Christian order, God chose as his instrument one who had renounced both family and citizenship, and had spent his best years in a monastery.

We never shall appreciate the greatness of Luther's work until we give this side of it a fuller recognition. This monk, who had become such of his own free will, who had given himself up to the austerities of that life in one of the severest orders, and who had aided Staupitz to fasten the heavy yoke on other shoulders, was led to hate monasticism with the hatred of one who saw how it had come between men and their God. He detested it, he said, because it unfitted men to bear rule in either the household, the nation, or the church, and all three were dear to him as God's gifts to men.

The family, he declares, is the true monastery for the perfection of mankind,—full of crosses in plenty for our purification, but full also of joys and blessings such as a monk cannot even imagine. So this monk, in his mature age of forty-three, took to wife one who had escaped from the same monastic bondage, and became a house-father, and a model of such to his countrymen. Thus he may be said to have laid the foundation of the household life of the Protestant ministry, although he was not the first of them to marry.

We need no better argument against clerical celibacy than is furnished by the record of what that pastor's household has been for the moral and intellectual elevation of Christendom. It has given to the world more great ministers of the word, more men of eminence in public life, in scientific pursuits, in literary and artistic production, and in philanthropic enterprise, than have the households of any other class or profession, not excepting the cottages of the shepherds and peasant farmers of Scotland.

The Christian ministry owns as "sons of the manse" Matthew Henry, John Wesley, Jonathan Edwards, Friedrich Schleiermacher, Frederick Maurice, and thousands of equal or lesser note, including some whose names are forever associated with the history of this Seminary. In the paths of

literature we find Lessing, Richter, the Humboldts, Jane Austen, the Brontë sisters, Thackeray, Tennyson, Matthew Arnold, Bancroft, Lowell, Holmes, and many more. While here and there a black sheep like Aaron Burr has been found to give point to the sneers about ministers' sons, careful investigation by competent statisticians has shown that Martin Luther saved to the world an astonishing amount of personal ability and spiritual capacity by breaking down the rule of clerical celibacy, and thus securing that the law of heredity no longer works to the survival of the unfittest.[1]

As it is on Protestant ground that the Christian family comes to fullest recognition and honor, so it is there that it has found the freest scope for growth, and has borne the finest fruit. It is only among

[1] Mr. W. H. H. Lecky, in his "History of Christian Morals from Augustus to Charlemagne," speaks in worthy terms of the Protestant pastor's family life: "Nowhere, it may be confidently asserted, does Christianity assume a more beneficial or more winning form than in those gentle clerical households which stud our land, constituting, as Coleridge said, 'the one idyl of modern life,' the most perfect type of domestic peace, and the centers of civilization in the remotest village. Notwithstanding some class narrowness and professional bigotry, notwithstanding some unworthy but half-unconscious mannerism, which is often most unjustly stigmatized as hypocrisy, it would be difficult to find in any other quarter so much happiness at once diffused and enjoyed, or so much virtue attained with so little tension or struggle. Combining with his sacred calling a warm sympathy with the intellectual, social, and political movements of his time; possessing the

Protestants that the family retains its primeval character as a worshiping society, and its head his primitive dignity as the priest of the household. When Rev. E. S. Ffoulkes went over from the Church of England to that of Rome, the French priest under whose care he had placed himself questioned him closely as to the usages of family life among Protestants. Next Sunday, to the new convert's astonishment, the priest repeated what he had heard from the pulpit, exhorting his flock to learn from the example of these English heretics a more Christian discipline than they possessed with all the advantages of membership in the true Church. It was that sermon apparently which first suggested to Mr. Ffoulkes that he was leaving behind him better things than any to which he was looking forward, and thus started the train of thought

enlarged practical knowledge of a father of a family; and entering with a keen zest into the occupations and the amusements of his parishioners,—a good clergyman will rarely obtrude his religious convictions into secular spheres, but yet will make them apparent in all. They will be revealed by a higher and deeper moral tone, by a more scrupulous purity in word and action, by an all-pervasive gentleness which refines, and softens, and mellows, and adds as much to the charm as to the excellence of the character in which it is displayed. In visiting the sick, relieving the poor, instructing the young, and discharging a thousand delicate offices for which a woman's tact is especially needed, his wife finds a sphere of labor which is at once intensely active and intensely feminine; and her example is not less beneficial than her ministrations."

which afterwards brought him back to Protestant ground.

"Not as though we have already attained, or are already made perfect." Indeed, in this as in other fields we make progress chiefly by reactions and exaggerations, which do justice to some neglected half-truth at the expense of some other half-truth heretofore exaggerated. Such, for instance, is the present reaction against that excessive stress upon parental authority which some fear must wreck the family life, but which probably will result in bringing it nearer to the Christian standard than it ever was.

For man makes progress as a drunken man mounts a horse. No sooner do you get him up on one side than he pitches over to the other. We learn truths by halves apparently contradictory until we come to apprehend our Lord's saying, "These ye ought to have done, and not to have left the other undone."

LECTURE III.

THE FAMILY: ITS RELATIONSHIPS, ITS SOCIAL PROBLEMS.

The family, as has been said, is the institute of the affections. This definition may seem to furnish but a sandy foundation for the household life as we conceive it. It is very commonly supposed that the affections are naturally variable and beyond our control,—that we love or dislike because of the attractiveness of those who come into relation with us, or the want of it. And it is argued by a certain school of moral anarchists, that, when the mutual attraction ceases, the dissolution of the relations founded on it is not only a right, but a duty.

But the affections, as Horace Greeley said in an inspired moment, are but "the flower and the fruition of the will,"—a truth nobly illustrated in his own life. The obligation of a child to love his parents does not depend on their attractiveness of character. He is to love them just because they

are his parents, and are given him to love. So equally the obligation of mutual love between husband and wife is not terminated by the discovery in either of qualities repugnant to the other, which had not been disclosed before marriage.

The freedom of choice in this matter, which happily exists in Western society, does not carry with it the freedom of unchoosing. When the new relationship has been constituted in the fear of God, such freedom to undo it is as needless as it must be pernicious to the character of those who claim it. In Eastern countries, where the wife generally is chosen for the husband by his parents, or by a family council, and never is seen by him until the very hour of their marriage, the relations thus constituted are happy in the great majority of cases.[1]

There need be no exceptions to this in countries where a freer and happier mode of entering the relationship is established. Where a right-minded man and woman find themselves in this relation,

[1] A Japanese friend tells me that the proportion of divorces to marriage in his country is one to three. This he believes to be due less to a want of harmony between husband and wife than to the disagreements between mothers-in-law and daughters-in-law. In Japan, as in Western Asia and the Slavonic parts of Europe, the husband takes his wife home to his father's house, and there she comes under the authority of his mother, taking rank little above a domestic servant. The abolition of this patriarchal arrangement my friend regards as the reform most needed in Japan.

which has been established of God for the happiness and perpetuity of the race, they will find it within their power to love each other, just because God in his providence has given them to each other, and has bid them love out of pure hearts fervently.

Nor is such love possible only to those who meet with a proper response in the other's affection. The highest and most God-like love, and yet that which is possible to every one of us, is that which "gives, hoping for nothing again." It is the unselfish friendship,[1] which loves as God loves the undeserving and the unworthy. The sorest situation thus brings man or woman up to the threshold of the loftiest moral attainment. To turn away from it with the plea of "incompatibility of temper," or the like, would be to barter the likeness of God for the social comforts of earthly life.

Our lax divorce laws, therefore, are unchristian and unphilosophical at once. They ignore the true nature of affection as founded in the will, and give scope and sanction to an arbitrariness which, if logically extended, would put an end to every social relationship, and furnish an absolution from every social duty. There lie in each of their loose provi-

[1] Dr. H. Clay Trumbull's forthcoming work on "Friendship" will set this great subject in a new and much needed light. Professor Drummond has touched on it very briefly in his last book, "The Changed Life."

sions the premises of a moral anarchy. It is indeed to Fourier's theory of "passional attraction," which has outlived his plans for our economic welfare, that we must trace those lax notions of what marriage implies that largely pervade even classes in which his other theories would excite nothing but horror. They are a survival from our Fourierite period, the years 1840–47. And our divorce laws are distinctly anti-Christian in implying that society exists that people may "have a good time," and not that they may be disciplined by life's experiences into likeness to the Eternal.

Co-operant with these loose divorce laws, and indeed a logical corollary for them, are the laws as to the separate estate of married women, which have been adopted in most of our states. No doubt these laws had a good purpose. They aimed at protecting the earnings of hard-worked women against the rapacity of drunken husbands. But they were made so sweeping in both scope and character that they have impaired the validity of the marriage bond itself. In its true idea marriage is a relationship in which—to use the popular phrase—two persons "pool their interests" unreservedly. As matters now stand, the state steps in and says they shall do nothing of the sort. It shall always be assumed that husband and wife shall have

separate interests, and that their identification is impossible.

Thus the primitive character of marriage as a state of complete community in ownership is subverted, and communism is forbidden in the only sphere in which it is both legitimate and advisable. The effect of such legislation is to suggest and facilitate divorce on any excuse with which the parties can salve their consciences.

From much the same quarter as the attacks on the permanence of the marriage relationship comes a criticism on the Christian idea of marriage as implying the subordination of the wife to the authority of the husband. There would be great force in this criticism if the popular notion that the Bible teaches a natural inferiority of women to men were a true one. What it does teach as regards the family and society generally, and what experience teaches, is that women and men differ widely, and are equal in spite of difference. They are like the right hand and the left: the former for toil and aggression, the latter for defense and caress.

Stating it broadly, man's function in the world is to care for *principles*, woman's is the care of *persons*. The one work is no more dignified or necessary than the other, but the difference between them makes a clear distinction between the proper

work of the two sexes. Man takes the more public side of life,—the state and its politics, the direction of great industrial projects, the duty of military service, and work in the courts. He must bear the brunt of social difficulties, and, in the last resort, he must decide on the questions they raise; else the family would be a two-headed, abnormal society.

But the authority with which he is clothed is to be exercised in a spirit of wisdom and consideration, and with a due appreciation of woman's special gifts of insight into the personal aspects of every question. It is not mere masculine dominance that will secure the finest direction of affairs. That feminine wisdom, that abundance of resource, to which Shakespeare does homage in his heroines, is an essential part of the world's wit. And, as the world grows wiser, it grows less exclusively masculine, and more ready to find the right uses for its left hand. This, however, is very different from the attempt to turn the left hand into a right hand by making women into an inferior kind of men, the apes, and not the equals, of the other sex. To those who practically deny all difference of social function, and would lay the burdens of citizenship and the like upon women, the Bible teaching is and must be offensive. It would be a great mistake to try to take away the offense.

"I would have you know," writes the Apostle, "that the head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is the man, and the head of Christ is God." These are wonderful words, and they certainly demand of the Christian wife a reverence toward her husband that our reformers will find objectionable. But they also lay upon the Christian husband the demand that he shall be worthy of that reverence,—worthy in some measure to stand in Christ's place toward her whom the Apostle proceeds to describe as "the glory of the man." Will it be well for women that any lower conception of the relationship should take the place of this, or any lighter demand be laid upon man?

But the relationship of husbands and wives is but one of several embraced in the family. That of parents and children demands our attention in equal measure. In the divine order, human beings derive their existence from others, and the race is thus bound up in a unity which extends through all the generations.

The scientific study of heredity in our own times has put us in a better position for appreciating the great stress the Bible lays on heredity, as the means of transmitting to each of us far more important things than physical resemblances of the child to its parents. That "it isn't all in bringing

up," that each of us is the result of hundreds of lives already lived, that we inherit moral strength and weakness, insight or obtuseness, the readiness or the unreadiness to act which may make or mar human life, is a thing now familiar to every one.

It is not a world made up of human atoms able to influence each other only in an external way, but a world of families, in whose bosoms the heritages of past generations for good or for evil are treasured. "I am thy servant, the son of thy handmaid," pleads the Psalmist with God. "I am the God of your fathers, of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob," is God's constant reminder of his covenant relation with the elect people. "Look unto the rock whence ye were hewn, and to the hole of the pit whence ye were digged," pleads the Prophet in encouraging the righteous remnant in Zion. The sense of a unity binding together the past and the present, the humblest of the nation to the greatest, was the outcome of this strong sense of descent from the forefathers of the people. It made the ties of fatherhood and of sonship more sacred to them. It made them recognize the family bond as a means of God's disclosure of himself to them. No doubt it suggested to many of them the truth which our Lord declared to be implicit in it, that all the dead—as men called them—were alive

unto God, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob.

But every truth is capable of a perversion, and in the days of Jeremiah and Ezekiel this truth had been turned into a lie by exaggerations which made it an excuse for moral inertness and despair. "The fathers have eaten sour grapes," the scorners said; "so the children's teeth are set on edge. Evil accumulates from generation to generation. The iniquity of the fathers passes over upon their children. We are given over to do all these abominations." Thus they anticipated the despair of our own age and made it theirs.

The two great prophets met the blasphemy by the related truth of personal responsibility. "All souls are mine, saith the Lord; the soul that sinneth, *it* shall die." To the same purpose was Ezekiel's wonderful vision of the valley of dry bones, which was a symbol of the spiritual desolation of Israel, and of their selfish severance from each other. To all human sight, that valley was anything but a valley of hope, yet the breath of God's spirit could turn its sand-worn, sun-bleached skeletons into a great army of living men. The nearness, the willingness, the mighty power of God, is the truth which is the complement of the doctrine of heredity. The eighteenth and thirty-

seventh chapters of Ezekiel are as pertinent to-day as when first spoken, as a safeguard against the exaggerations which would use natural environment and human heredity as disproof of human responsibility.

Closely parallel to the notions of the old Hebrew "scorners" is the teaching of the lower sociology that moral character is the outcome of a slow evolution, which is capable of no more than infinitesimal modifications in any generation or any one life. All souls—we say with the Prophet—are God's. They are in his hands. He can work his wonders on them in turning the valley of dry bones into the gathering-place of his hosts.

Even scientific investigators, who study this question without theological prepossessions, are beginning to question the stress laid on heredity by the schools of Darwin and Spencer. Some of them go so far as to assert that the father can transmit to his child by mere heredity nothing but what he inherited from his father in the same way, and that the transmission of acquired qualities is due entirely to the educational influence he exerts on the child's life and character after its birth. This reaction is significant, but, like all reactions, it probably is an exaggeration. It certainly is hard to reconcile it with the phenomena of atavism, or the child's exhi-

bition of qualities found not in the father, but in ancestors more remote.

But the highest significance of the parental relation was disclosed by the coming of the Son of God to reveal to us "the Father, from whom every family in heaven and in earth is named." Once or twice, as in David's blessing of the people when gifts were brought for the building of the temple, in the wonderful Psalm 103, and in one of the closing chapters of Isaiah, there is an approach to a recognition of the fatherhood of God. But it is always, I think, with the feeling that this was a bold figure of speech, an anthropomorphic expression. It is in the vision of the eternal Son that we discover that "Father" is a name which belongs to the very nature of God, and that "Our Father which art in heaven" are the fittest words with which to approach him. Here we know of a surety that all earthly fatherhood is but the shadow of that which is divine, and that fatherhood is one of the means by which God discloses his nature to his children.

So Christ uses it with his disciples, in reminding them how much more God, their Father, is ready to give to them than they as evil men are to give to their children. And in his threefold effort (Luke 15) to make scribe and Pharisee understand what the

mind of the Father was to his lost children the publicans and the harlots, he appeals first to that interest in dumb animals which had been drilled into them by their long continuance in the shepherd life; second, to that love of money which had become so strong in them in their later history; and, third, to that love they had for their children,—a love they never had lost in all the ages of their later history.

So in the gospel light human fatherhood becomes a divine trust. It is this essential name of God which is put upon a man when he has a child of his own to bring up for the great uses of life. He is to be the first and chief interpreter of God to the child. He is to make his fatherhood reflect that of God in its holy firmness and its inexhaustible tenderness.

His child is to be baptized into the name of the Father, that God in that ordinance may lay his hand on it and say "This child is my child now. It never can cease to be so except by its wilful renunciation of me. I have apprehended it thus, that it may live to apprehend me." It is baptized into the name of the Son as an acknowledgment that its humanity is to stand no more in Adam, but in Christ, who is the new head of a redeemed humanity, who has reconciled God to man, and man to God. It is to

be baptized into the name of the Holy Ghost as a confession of the divine nearness in regenerating power, so that the evils and sins which have come down to it from past generations, and even from "the father of all living," need not overwhelm its spirit, as the divine renewal ever suffices to cleanse the conscience from dead works, and to make it a new creature in Christ Jesus. This I take to be the new light the gospel poured upon this human relationship, and the meaning of the baptism of the child as consecrating its life to the triune God.

It is notable what a place is given to childhood in the Gospels. Next to their mothers the children are especially singled out for the Master's loving kindness. His own childhood we find in Luke, probably as the beloved physician heard it from Mary's lips. He took the little ones in his arms, and laid his hands upon them and blessed them, Mark says. He set a little child in the midst of the contentious disciples, and told them the child-like, loving, unanxious spirit was that of the divine kingdom. He watched the children at their play in the streets of Caphernaum, and drew parables from their actions. The children welcomed him with hosannas, while scribe and Pharisee, and even the disciples, trooped along as dumb as the ass he rode. When after his death, resurrection and ascension,

his Church lifted up her voice in appeal to the Father of all, they spoke of the Son as "thy holy child Jesus." The words are appropriate, for our Lord was one who never left his childhood behind him, and out of whose heart the child never died. So Wordsworth desired for himself:

> "The Child is father of the Man;
> And I could wish my days to be
> Bound each to each in natural piety."

It is only in our own time that we begin to appreciate this side of the Gospels, for it is characteristic of modern life that we place a much higher value on the child and his character. The Bible is the only child's book that ever claimed to reveal God's will,—the only book fitted by its character and its purpose to attract the interest, call forth the affections, and stimulate the intellectual growth, of children. All other so-called Bibles are written by grown people for grown people. But from characters and standpoints as widely distant as Thomas H. Huxley and John Ruskin, we have the testimony of what this book is to childhood's opening years. Our Christian literature, however, has been slow in getting to ground as broad and as human as the Bible in this respect.

It has been remarked by some one, that there

are no children, and but one mother, in Shakespeare. That, however, is a fault common to all the literature between him and the Bible in one direction, and between him and Wordsworth in the other. Luther stands out in the wilderness of this great intermediate space as the only child-lover who has given that feeling literary expression. All the rest, hardly excepting Cowper and Goldsmith, are denizens of a childless world, or at least are deaf, dumb and blind to the presence and the freshening influence of childhood in human society. Since Wordsworth wrote, "We are Seven" (in 1798), a thousand others have followed him, and that not only in English, but notably Victor Hugo in French literature. I do not hesitate to class this as one of our modern approximations to a really Christian standpoint, one more elimination of a pagan survival from our whole view of human life.

It is true that this change has been attended by a relaxation of family discipline, which has been harmful. So much might have been expected. The household discipline of a few generations back was needlessly harsh and repressive. Even where there was the warmest affection in the minds of parents toward their children, there was so little expression of this that the child was left altogether

in ignorance of it. Many a man and woman never had the faintest conception of what a parent naturally feels towards a child until they had grown to manhood or womanhood, and became parents themselves. They rarely or never heard a word of endearment from their father's lips. They never knew the touch of his hand in a caress. And even mothers exercised a constraint over the expression of their real feelings which was harmful. I have no doubt there were many exceptions; but I say this on the warrant of many independent observers of our social ways in the family. It seemed to be assumed that the only wise treatment of a child was severity; and the child learned to avoid the presence and the society of his parents rather than to seek it, even when he was conscious of no wrong-doing that need come between him and them.

Was this interpreting God to the child, and, if so, after what fashion? Certainly not after that of the New Testament,—nay, not after that of the Old! "As one whom his mother comforteth, so will I comfort you." "Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him. For he knoweth our frame; he remembereth that we are dust." Such a household discipline must tend to hinder the child from entering into the

sense of what is implied in God's fatherhood. The word "father" would have for him none of the joyful and tender associations with which God means us fathers to clothe it, in order that it may be a stepping-stone to a knowledge of his unfailing compassions, his self-sacrificing love.

On the other hand, there certainly is much in modern fatherhood which must fail to interpret God to the child, but fail in the opposite direction. We live in an age and a land of indulgence. The rapid growth of our national wealth has put much within our power to which former generations were not accustomed. A new standard of living has been formed, or, rather, is forming, in which simplicity often gives way to luxury, and economy to extravagance. We have nothing quite settled yet. Our whole society is in the condition of a family suddenly come into the possession of wealth, but as yet without the chastened taste and the developed judgment that are required to use wealth to enrich life, and not merely to adorn it.[1]

In such a time over-indulgence, first of self and then of those for whom we are responsible, becomes a besetting sin. Children are allowed to have their own way, without much reference to what kind of

[1] See Dr. H. Clay Trumbull's "Hints on Child-Training" (Philadelphia, 1891) for an ample discussion of this subject in all its aspects.

a way it is. Their every wish is indulged, even when good taste, or the comfort of others, or the child's own welfare, must be sacrificed. It is so much easier to give in than to refuse; and so we take credit for kindness to them, where in truth we are kind only to ourselves. The effect of this is seen in the manners before it is visible in the morals of the young. European observers are kind enough to say that the American traveler generally is a tolerable sort of person, but that his children are the most intolerable torments to be found in the European resorts for health or sight-seeing.

What kind of interpretation of God's fatherhood is this to the child? what conception does it foster of the divine holiness, the divine law? To what relaxation of the moral nature though an atrophy of the powers of obedience and self-constraint is it leading the coming generations. It is not the God of love such a child will be helped to conceive, for all real love is attended by its shadow,—a capacity to hate utterly what makes its proper object unlovable. It is rather "the God of infinite good-nature," as Coleridge defines the Unitarian conception of Deity, the *bon Dieu* of the French. It was an American child who formulated exactly this new theology for us. When told that God would be

angry with her if she did something that was wrong, she replied: "Oh, no! He'll forgive me. That is what he's for!" Childhood sometimes is notably logical.

Let us hear what a French philosopher has to say on this head: "I must insist upon the principle of authority and of constraint, for, however disagreeable it may be to our thinking, it is of great importance. Without it dissolution and anarchy make their way into the family. A spirit of premature freedom withdraws the child from the authority of its parents. Youth pretends to the independence of maturity, and childhood lays claim to the prerogatives of youth, so that we have young gentlemen of twelve and old fellows of twenty-five. Not that I would belittle the dignity of childhood and youth, or delay the moment of their emancipation. It is exactly for the protection of both that I plead. These 'liberal' views of the training of the young break down just at the point where they propose to treat the child as a man already formed. And then the practice always outruns the theory: it is so pleasant, and so well suits our own weakness, to come upon a doctrine which justifies us to ourselves and to our neighbors. Hence this 'let alone' theory of child-training, which is a note of our times, and which gives the admirers of the past

their opportunity to groan over the decay of family character."[1]

Nor is it only the family that suffers through the abandonment of parental authority. Social discipline is corrupted at its very fountain-head. That reverence for authority which is fundamental to all society can be taught only at home; and he finds nothing in life sacred who has not learned the sanctities of the household life. The child brought up in a disorderly and lawless home can be no element of orderliness and loyalty in the state. This is the significance of the commandment, which commands towards father and mother no mere outward obedience, but the honor the heart only can render, and which makes the permanence of society dependent upon the diffusion of this habit through the members of the nation.

Fatherhood, then, is interpretative of God,—is educational in the highest sense. The father is the divinely appointed educator of his children. The old covenant enjoined this upon him in the most specific terms: "Ye shall teach these words unto your children, talking of them, when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down and when thou risest up."

[1] Paul Janet: "La Famille. Ouvrage couronnée par l'Academie Française." 5me édition. Paris. 1864. (Pp. 119-120.)

We have come to think, in modern times, that all this can be attended to by delegation, and that the rise of a teaching class sets the father free to make money for his household, while others attend to their moral and spiritual culture. But this is a mischievous delusion. There are things a father can teach his child as no other human being can teach them, because he is invested naturally with an authority which he cannot delegate, and which the best teachers can possess only to a limited extent. Especially is this true of the ethical views of life a child acquires from the precepts and the example of his father. The father who lives up to his privileges is prophet and priest as well as king of his household. As such he can do more for his boy's moral training than can a schoolmaster, who has fifty or more to look after, without the parental interest in any of them. And that teaching, as Mr. Philip Gilbert Hamerton well says, must come to the boy with the authority of personal influence, if it is to come home to him at all.

Professor Seeley strongly stigmatizes the neglect of this parental teaching as immoral and often disastrous to the young. "The father," he says, "has not time to do all that is necessary to be done for his children; part he will do himself, but part must be entrusted to others. He hands over to others

the child's education, his mind, his soul. He reserves to himself the finance department. It is not easy to estimate the mischief produced by this division of labor. I know scarcely any cause from which the community suffers so much." "I have met with young men who have been suffered to grow up in an incredible intellectual barbarism, the father working conscientiously for them all the time, but delegating to others the particular work of education." I have heard an eminent business man of our city say that if he had his life to live over again, he most probably would accumulate less wealth, but his relations to his sons would be much more intimate, and their characters very different.

Nor would the boys have been the only gainers by such a parental training. The teacher would have been taught also. Not only would ethical and spiritual truth have acquired a new distinctness to him, but he would have been forced to test his own practice by the principles he inculcated, and thus he might have been led to a loftier plane of living in business and elsewhere. It is not for the children's sake alone that they are given into our hands. They are meant to help us nearer to right, to duty, to God. If ever God seems to do his last and utmost to turn a man back to himself, it is when he gives a child into his keeping, to train it

for the issues of life or of death. Then he seems to force us to believe, to hope, to pray. But all this we evade. We have made fatherhood a cheap privilege; it is to cost us nothing but money. But thus, as Professor Seeley says, we "devolve upon others all that is valuable and dignified in fatherhood, and retain only its burdens and anxieties. What an impoverishment of character of the paternal dignity!"

But school and church conspire to make the abdication easy. The school so loads its curriculum with studies, and requires such an amount of home work from the children, as leaves them but little intellectual energy, little time even, for the home teaching. And the church too often burdens the Day of Rest with such a multiplicity of duties and services that the Sabbath eve is *the* time of weariness. "I bless God," said a good man of our city, "that there is but one day of rest in the week. If there were two, it would soon finish me."

Of late years, not only has the number of hours demanded by church services increased, but they have taken away the Sunday evenings, which once were the especial season for family intercourse in the study of God's Word, recitation of the Catechism and the like. Albert Barnes's church was one of the first in Philadelphia to accede to this practice,

which came in with the Methodists. In his later years, he said that if he had had his ministry to live over again, the change from afternoon to evening service would not be made. He had come to see how injurious to the life of the family was this destruction of the evening fireside talk.

The relation of the children of the family to each other is one which depends chiefly on those of the parents to the children. It is under the wise, firm, and loving rule of a good father and mother that children acquire the self-restraint and the mutual friendliness which make them kind and gracious to each other, just as right relations to God are the best foundation for such relations with our fellowmen. Hence it is that the message of God's fatherhood carries with it the truth that those who have become alive to that and to him through his Son are brought into brotherhood and sisterhood with each other. Thus this human relationship also has a divine ground on which to rest, and through the discipline of the family we come to appreciate the nature of that fellowship with God's people to which we are called in his church.

These brotherly and sisterly relations of the home are thus an anticipation of the broader relations of the world beyond the home. The child should be brought to feel that they are the beginnings of life's

responsibilities as well as of its joys, and that lessons of sympathy, self-sacrifice and forgivingness are to be acquired first in the simple things of his daily life. Greatly has human life been enriched by the heroism which has responded to especial needs, where the younger children have been thrown upon the care of an elder. Greatly have individuals been helped by a brother's or a sister's thoughtfulness and life-long friendship. The relation of Wordsworth to his sister Dorothy, who recalled him from his skepticism, showed him his vocation as a poet, and gave up her life to enabling him to fulfil that vocation, is but one of the many illustrations of what brother and sister may be to each other.

The Church has duties to the family, of whose faithful discharge she should take the utmost heed. In the family, as some one says, is the organon of our Christian theology. Every time she takes the Creed upon her lips, the Church asserts the sanctity of the family relations as having their ground in those which are of the Godhead itself. In the marriage relation she is told to see the type of her own relation to her divine-human head, the Bridegroom of the Church. In the brotherhood and the sisterhood of the family she finds the explanation of the relations which bind her own membership in one.

The family is the unit out of which the church is built up. You see this in the constant reference to the conversion and the reception of households in the Acts of the Apostles, and in the references to devout households as foci of spiritual culture in the apostolic Epistles. The Christian Church is not narrower or more exclusive in this respect than was the old theocracy. It cannot exclude all children from its membership, when that at least took in the half.

Each Christian congregation is a spiritual organism made up of a collection of lesser congregations gathered from the Christian homes. The house should "join hard to" the Church, as the house of Titus Justus "joined hard to the synagogue." This is well symbolized by the family pew in the Protestant churches.

Many have been the attempts to break up the family inside the church. The old Puritans of New England seated the people of each town—that is, the heads of families—in the order of social dignity, and left the children to shift for themselves on the pulpit steps, in the gallery, or around the doors. Methodism sundered the sexes on opposite sides of the church, which was the last remnant of John Wesley's High Church ideas. But both Puritan and Methodist have had to conform to the

family arrangement, as that which belongs to the fitness of things. The family thus attains recognition as the unit of church life.

The family is the oldest of worshiping societies, and the priesthood of the father is the oldest of priesthoods. No other priest has any right to encroach upon his prerogatives. The confessionals of the Roman Catholic Church represent a claim on the part of a priesthood to penetrate the inmost privacy of the family, to constitute themselves judges of the most private relations, and to direct others in the performance of duties they have renounced for themselves. From the sociological point of view, that claim has no foundation in right, as it has none in the Word of God.

The family worship of the Protestant household is the positive complement of its rejection of the confessional. It is the assertion of the family's direct and immediate relation to God, the priestly and prophetic dignity of the head of the household, and the right of him and his to the freest access to every utterance of the Father to his children in the Scriptures. It is the reminder to churches and hierarchies that the family holds the more venerable place in the world's spiritual history, and still holds its place as a co-ordinate institution of the spiritual order of the race. As the creation of

God, who has guarded its existence, avenged every wrong done to it, punished its sins, and rewarded its faithfulness, it is as truly a part of the supernatural order of human life as is the church itself. So we find it depicted in the lives of the old patriarchs in the Book of Genesis, which show how the responsibilities of the family life and its trials led men to God. So we find it taught through the whole course of Jewish and Christian history, showing that here we have no earthly and godless relation, which priests and churches may use at their pleasure.

If we had no Bible, the records of all the ancient nations would rise up to rebuke priestly claims to be the channel by which the family must find access to God. As Foustel de Coulanges and other investigators have shown, the family always was a worshiping institution, and especially so in our own Aryan race. Its household gods are the oldest of the gods. The bride was solemnly initiated into their worship. The child was dedicated to them. The dead were borne to their last resting-place in their company. This worship was the constitutive principle of the family. And the gods of the city were only the family gods of the oldest families, the aristocracy of its later organization.

This recalls another feature of the patriarchal life

we find in the Book of Genesis; namely, the development of the family into a larger social unit, into the house, the tribe. Sociologists have begun to estimate that book at its true value, as the most authentic record we possess of the process of social transition from the family to the nation. Half a century ago the theory that the family was the origin of the body politic was still a jest of the political theorists. It was held that society had been created by a civil compact, in which the individual had surrendered a part of his natural rights to the authority called government, then and there constituted, in order to obtain security for the rest.

To-day no sociologist would think of giving the sanction of his name to a theory so destitute of historic foundation. To-day the patriarchal theory, with some modification from its old form and a rejection of the inferences the Tories drew from it, is universally accepted. We see now that Moses knew more about the matter than the writers who talked of a social contract. The notion that government, historically considered, derives its existence and its powers from the consent of the governed, is found to be as untenable in the state as in the family.

The tribe, then, is a transitional form. It grows out of a deep instinct of our nature that society has

other ends than the exercise of the affections based on kinship and marriage,—that it exists to secure men their natural rights, and, along with these rights, their liberty. When this instinct became socially operative, the family at once undertook to satisfy it, to be at once the institute of affections and that of rights. It thus became the extended or artificial family of the sociologists. Its head thus held an ambiguous position. On one side he was the father, with a father's claim to affection and implicit obedience; on the other he was a magistrate, with the right to respect as the representative of the law.

This ambiguity was a source of social confusions without number. The ambiguous organization accomplished neither of the purposes it had in view. It acquired a harsher and more legal character through the family head's being regarded as a magistrate. It made the equal administration of justice impossible through putting it into the hands of a father, and not of an official. It marks the survival of these ideas in Scotland to the sixteenth century, that the Scotch complained of Cromwell's judges as "kinless loons, intent on naething but bare, indifferent fair-play."

So for the sake of the family itself a farther step was needed,—the differentiation of society into the family and the nation.

LECTURE IV.

THE NATION: ITS IDEA AND ITS DEVELOPMENT.

"Man," Aristotle says, "is by nature a political animal."[1] The state, the body politic, has its roots in our human nature. It is thus mediately the creation of God, who has made our human nature what it is. It is by our nature, not by any deliberate choice or act of volition, that the state exists. We did not make it; we were born into it, as we were born into the family. He who is connected with no state is a monster, either above or below the level of human nature, as Aristotle says, and more likely to be below than above.

Aristotle thus contradicts the theory of the social contract even before its origination by Epicurus. He does not look back to a time when as yet the state was not, for he knows of no such

[1] "Ανθρωπος φύσει πολιτικὸν ζῶον.

time. He does not look downward to barbarian peoples to discover a condition of political chaos, out of which society emerged by a bargain between savages; he knows of no barbarians so low as to be destitute of political order.

And he is fully sustained by modern investigation. It is true that travelers from their casual observation of savage races have told us of peoples among whom political order did not exist and no government was recognized. But the closer observation of those who have lived among such peoples always has discovered the presence of a political order, however rudimentary in form, and of a political authority, however imperfectly developed. The savage state from which men emerged by the (alleged) social contract is a country from which nobody but the political theorists has any news. To them we leave it.

The state is founded in human nature. It is the institute of rights, and rights are implicit in our human nature. They are necessary to its complete and harmonious development. They are natural rights because of this relation to human nature. They exist in idea and by moral right apart from the order of the state, so that we compare and criticise states with reference to the completeness with which they realize these natural rights. But

they are realized, they exist in fact, only through the state. They do not antedate its historic existence, as the theorists assumed when they spoke of the social contract as growing out of a surrender of a part of men's natural rights in order to constitute a government for the better defense of the rest.

Men have not fewer rights because they have given up some for the sake of making a body politic. Practically they would have none unless the state existed. Rights do not exist at all for men's enjoyment until the state establishes and defines them. And if a man were to put himself outside the pale of political society,—as Herbert Spencer says he has a right to do,—he still would be entitled to so much consideration as humanity suggested, but he would not possess any of the rights which are ideally his as a human being.

These natural rights are such as are necessary to the complete development of our human nature. They may be taken broadly as those defined in the second table of the Mosaic law: the right of life, of family, of property, and of good name. All these are necessary to the completeness of our ethical culture. Abolish any one of them, and you have stunted in so far the ethical growth of the people to whom the right has been denied.

Take away, for instance, the right of property. Establish all ownership in the state, and thus secure an absolute equality of social condition. By so doing, indeed, you will remove from society many of the worst temptations to wrong-doing. But you also will take away many of the greatest occasions of right-doing. You will have checked the flow of benevolence, abolished the demand for business integrity, and created a human type of limited moral experience and attenuated moral capacity. Human nature will have lost far more by the abolition of property than it will have gained by the elimination of the temptations that attend it.

Furthermore, private property is esssential to personal liberty. There is no freedom of speech or of action possible to members of communities in which it does not exist. In those societies in which the social development has been arrested before it reached this point, the community dominates the mind and conscience of the individual. Mrs. Grundy is omnipotent in the Russian mir, the Hindoo village community, the Indian tribe. He who will not submit to her becomes an outcast, is tabooed,—the most terrible form of the boycott.

It is only where every man can and most men do possess the means of self-support independently of

the will of society, that any man can cherish and assert an opinion which is not shared by the community of which he is a member. The Hindoo who becomes a Christian, while the rest of the villagers remain in Brahmanism or Mohammedanism, must leave his village. If he do not, they will "cut off his pipe and water" until they force him either to apostatize or to go. Hence the Christian missionaries in India are forced to convert their stations into industrial establishments for the employment of their converts, or to establish Christian villages in which they may be placed.

This recalls what has been said already of the historic origination of the state. Aristotle has defined its true cause; the occasion on which that cause operated is what history discloses. Very early in the development of society the need of something more than the family—the institute of the affections—must have been felt. But the plan of forming a new and larger association of mankind for the purpose of meeting this need was not the first that occurred to them. Rather they tried to make the family serve the uses of the state,—to be at once the institute of the affections and the institute of rights.

Thus arose the extended or artificial family,—the clan, sept, or tribe. Each of these names stands

for a transitional form of society, which could have no right to permanence as it realized no ideal. It was not a true family, for it substituted artificial fatherhood and brotherhood for those which are natural, and demanded for the patriarchal chief the respect and reverence due properly to the real father. The natural family had not full scope within this larger group, as demands were made upon its members which constituted a divided allegiance within the household.

On the other hand, the extended family was not a true state, as it established rights only within a definite (real or assumed) kinship, instead of between all the residents of a political area. It also fell short of being a true state because it failed to recognize the natural rights in their entirety. Within the family, communism is the natural order of things. All things are owned equally by all, except so far as differences of sex and age enforce distinctions in the character and adaptability of clothes and the like. Now the extended family, in trying to be a state and a family at the same time, naturally carried over this family communism into the larger unit. Hence it is that the tribe everywhere is more or less communistic, especially in the case of land. Because of this, in the tribal stage the ethical progress of society is stunted, its economic

efficiency is impaired, and the freedom of the individual hardly can be said to exist.

Thus the tribe cannot be said to realize any ideal, and therefore I have denied its right to a permanent existence. Yet it not only does exist, but it probably embraces the majority of mankind within its various types of organization. As Sir Henry Sumner Maine says, the vast majority of mankind have stereotyped their institutions. Only a petty minority, which in Tennyson's

"Parliament of Man, the Federation of the World,"

would be voted into a corner, have really succeeded in differentiating the state from the family, and in giving each free scope for the development of its true life. It is to this minority that we turn when we would study the state and its problems.

As the civilized state thus took its rise in a great forward movement, by which it emerged from the confusions of the tribal stage, so progress has been a law of its existence ever since. The wise blending of progress with permanence, as Coleridge says, has been the sanest national policy; and where either of these acquires an undue preponderance over the other, the state fails to achieve the best condition for the common welfare. Its division into political parties, generally on the line between loyalty to the

old and aspiration toward the new, has been our rough way of expressing this in modern times; and these divisions supply a means of keeping the national life from stagnation and the corruption that attends stagnation. For it is one of our human frailties that we are unable to get hold of more than half a new truth at once, and then must wait for a reaction against our exaggerations of that to bring the other half into view. And so progress is achieved, as Hegel shows, by the development and the reconciliation of antagonisms.

"The Jews," says John Stuart Mill, "instead of being stationary, like other Asiatics, were, next to the Greeks, the most progressive people of antiquity, and, jointly with them, have been the starting point and main propelling agency of modern cultivation." He finds the "conditions favorable to progress" in the existence of the prophetic order, where relations to kings and priests created "the antagonism of influences which is the only real security for continued progress. Religion, consequently, was not there—what it has been in so many other places—a consecration of all that was once established, and a barrier against further improvement."

The fact Mr. Mill states is beyond question; his explanation of it is but partially the real one.

Jewish national progress antedates the rise of the prophetic order to the rank of a national influence, and—as Dr. Franklin once remarked—it furnishes many points of contact and resemblance to our own history.

Speaking broadly, the period from the death of Joshua to the establishment of the monarchy corresponds to the colonial period of our own history. The people had as yet little sense of a collective national existence. The tribal habit was still dominant, and in most cases the head of the tribe, whom Moses had recognized as its *shophet*, or judge (Deut. 1 : 5), was the highest authority. But even the tribes (*mattoth*) were organic bodies, and were subdivided into clans (*mish'pakoth*) and these again into households (*batim*); and every man held his place in the land through his membership in one of these, "his father's house." A bond of union running through the tribes were the tribe of Levi, which were given cities within the territories of the other twelve tribes, instead of a territory of their own, so that they might reside in every part of the country, and keep the people in mind of the national covenant which made them one people. When special dangers arose, which threatened a part of the land with foreign conquest, judges of wider authority arose also, and ruled the tribes they had been the means

of preserving from this calamity. But none of these established permanent dynasties, and none of them before Samuel seem to have "judged all Israel." The particularist or provincial feeling, the centrifugal tendency, dominated the political life of the country.

Whatever disloyalty to the unseen King may have been blended with their motives in desiring a hereditary kingship in place of a judgeship, the demand itself was a natural outcome of the people's realization of their danger in the midst of strong and hostile populations, and possibly in view of a new migration of Philistines from Crete (Caphthor) into the coast land of the south. The first king was little more than a military chief, who gave the nation no local center, and who proved unable to preserve order within it because he was unable to submit himself to law.

The second founded a dynasty which lasted four hundred and seventy years. He established a permanent center for both the political and the religious life of the nation; he organized the military and civil services and the national revenues; and he even secured to the nation the hegemony of the Semitic peoples of Western Asia by his conquests and treaties. His reign and his son's showed what the nation was capable of. But the temptation to follow foreign

fashions in statecraft and heathen practices in worship got the better of Solomon's wisdom. The particularist tendency, which had been kept in abeyance under these kings, found a voice in Ephraim under his successor, and a leader in Jeroboam. It raised its slogan: "To your tents, O Israel!" and the nation was rent into two.

The secession of the ten tribes was under auspices which boded ill for the future of the kingdom they formed. It lost contact with the center of national worship, as well as of government. It lost the tribe of Levi, which had served to unite the tribes in a sense of their common vocation. It gave the highest sanction to the principle of local revolt, and to lawless adventurers who founded dynasty after dynasty in the murder of their predecessors. It thus lay open to the encroachments of aggressive heathenism, while the central authority at Shomron was so weak that its armies were defeated more than once by those of the compact kingdom of Judah. And it was the first to fall when Asshur became strong enough to seize the hegemony of the Semites of the coast lands.

As if to fill the vacuum left by the loss of temple and priesthood, the prophetic order arose first in Israel. There alone we find "schools of the prophets" furnishing centers for the pure worship of

Jehovah and the observance of the national feasts of the new moon and the sabbath. The work of the prophets was to keep alive in the nation the sense of its covenant relation with God, to make them discern the contrast between the righteousness of Jehovah and the lawlessness and wilfulness of the gods of the nations round about them, and to interpret to them the meaning of the just judgments by which their unfaithfulness to the covenant was punished. In this work they were often brought into an antagonism to kings and priests, which was a means of leading them forward to the apprehension of truths on a more spiritual side, so that we find a constant "progress of doctrine" in the prophetic teaching from the days of Elijah to those of Malachi.

It is this broadening and deepening of the stream of prophetic revelation which gives the especial interest to their work, and constitutes them, as Franz Baader says, an intermediate link between the Jewish and the Christian dispensations. And with it came the deeper sense of the nation's and the world's need of a deliverer, who should bring order out of its confusion, and establish the kingdom of God throughout the earth. At the same time we must remember, as Mr. Mill says, that the priestly order, the house of Levi, is an element in Jewish

history just as indispensable as the prophetic order, as it constituted the firm vertebral column which secured the historic unity of the nation throughout the changing generations.

In appearance the prophets failed in their mission. First Israel and then Judah—which became still more remarkable as a field of prophetic activity—was swept away by the great empires of the Euphrates. Both calamities were directly traceable to the unfaithfulness of the nation to its own vocation, its loss of all sense of the worth of the institutions which Jehovah had given it. But in truth the Captivity was simply their removal to a severer school, in which they did learn much that they could not be taught by a gentler discipline. Assyrian and Babylonian conquest taught them the meaning and the worth of their national order and its organic institutions, just when these seemed to be swept away forever by "the inorganic despotisms" of the Assyrian, Babylonian, and Persian empires.

They came back to their own land with some great truths so burned into their national consciousness that they never lost their hold on them again; and if in later days they were found faulty as regards their grasp of still more advanced truths, they, at any rate, had acquired a degree of loyalty

to Jehovah which made a national relapse into open and vile idolatries impossible to them. And their contact with other nations combined with their intenser interest in the truths of God's disclosures to them, to fit them for their great vocation as the historical basis for the establishment of a universal society, the church of Christ.

But, as the later prophets warned them, another sin than open idolatry had begun to lay its hold on their spiritual life, and one closely cognate to idolatry. The love of possession, of lands and herds, of money, had grown so powerful among them as to nullify some of the most beneficent features of the Mosaic legislation, to destroy the sense of national brotherhood, to induce them to enslave their own brethren by taking advantage of their needs (Jer. 34 : 8 ff.; Neh. 5). The introduction of coinage by the Persians, and the extension of international commerce in the later centuries of their history, gave especial opportunity for devotion to gain. It blended with their religiousness in Pharisaism, and unfitted them to comprehend a gospel of free, unbought grace. It hardened their hearts against each other, and shut them out of sympathy with the generosity of God. It made them value their own position as the covenant people as a privilege peculiar to themselves, and not a trust for all

mankind. It turned the gracious messages of the psalmists and prophets into a spiritless letter of a hard law.

Practically, covetousness rent the nation, not into the tribes and clans of their old local jealousies, but into self-seeking human atoms, incapable of co-operation except in some fierce fit of partisanship which might be caused by the fear of losing their selfish possessions, earthly or spiritual. More than any other sin this seems to have eaten out the heart of their religiousness, unfitted them to welcome Christ's teaching, and thus led to the destruction of their institutions and the dispersion of their nation.

And shall we say that the story is without its warnings for us? An American who looks beneath the surface of his own country's history to find the leading hand of God in it, must be impressed, I think, with the pertinence of the whole story, not in its forms but in its principles, to modern situations. The welding of the people into one by providences light and dark; the part played by great men raised up at critical moments to carry out the divine plan; the continual battle with, and slow victory over, selfish localizing tendencies which appear now in one quarter and now in another; the imperial ambitions which threaten to turn the people aside from their true vocation; the belief in mere

lawless power or material bulk to the destruction of faith in a God of righteousness; the lessons as to the worth of national order and unity learned in hours of calamity and storm; the love of temporal prosperity such as must lead to the destruction of humanity, religion, law, and finally of national order;—there are not merely Jewish experiences.

These are the facts of Jewish history which emphasize the truth that the Jews were a typical people, and that the Old Testament is the key to the meaning of national life. From that book we learn that every nation has an unseen and righteous King, and that it is to witness against the more open or subtle forms of idolatry by its loyalty to his law and obedience to his commandments. We shall have done well to set aside mere human kings, if in so doing we have removed a veil which hid the divine King from us. It is his authority which lies behind that of the nation. It is by his warrant that wars are waged for national defense, and punishments even to death are inflicted for the vindication of justice; and in his name that evidence is given in the courts of law.

It is objected that the Jewish nation was a theocracy, and that modern nations are not and cannot be such. It is worth while to ask what is the meaning of the term "theocracy." It is one of those words

which are tossed about in controversy, or peaceful discussion, without much care being taken to discriminate between apparent and real senses of the term. It frequently is used to mean the rule of a priestly or clerical caste, where the term "hierocracy" would be better employed. In that sense the Jewish nation was not a theocracy. Such a government existed in Egypt contemporaneously with the earlier Jewish kings, but it never existed in Israel. The rights of the judges and the kings to the control of national affairs were too well settled for that.

Another sense put upon the word is that it is a government in which religious and political affairs are so intimately blended that they are inextricable. Every official of the state is a religious official, and every religious official has rank in the state. Offenses against the state are treated as religious apostasy, and offenses against religion as treason. In other words, the state and the church have not been differentiated from each other.

Now it may fairly be said that in this secondary and modified sense the Jewish nation was a theocracy such as no modern nation is called to be. But the same is true of every nation and people of the ancient world. It is far more true of Egypt and of Assyria than of Judea, and not less true of Athens and Rome than of it.

In the pre-Christian age, religion naturally and inevitably took rank as a portion of the civil service. The highest interest of society naturally passed under the care of the state. Religious offenses were treated as offenses directly against the public order, and worthy of temporal penalties. Political offenses (not excepting the proposal to make fundamental changes in the laws of the state) were held worthy of dire spiritual penalties. In fine, such a public order as still exists in every Moslem state, and in Byzantine Russia, was universal in ancient society.

But so far from being especially characteristic of the Jews, this confusion of the two spheres of social life probably had less scope with them than in any other country of antiquity. By the setting apart of a priestly family, and the judgments inflicted upon those who thrust themselves into its office, a witness for the distinction of the two spheres was already begun. And while religious toleration, of course, was impossible so long as church and state were thus blended, the Jewish system went as far toward tolerance as was possible in that stage of social development.

But I do not think we have yet reached the true sense of the term "theocracy." It is one independent of stages of social development. It simply

asserts that God is the author and ruler of all society, familiar, political, or ecclesiastical.

A theocratic nation is neither more nor less than one which acknowledges God as its supreme ruler, regards his will as the highest standard of national conscience, and sees in him a king as real as any of any earthly dynasty. It recognizes all national authority as delegated by him. It holds his law as revealed in the written Word and in the human conscience to be a higher law to which the wronged and oppressed may always appeal. It demands of human law that it shall steadily approximate towards the ideal of perfect righteousness, which we possess in God. It demands of national order that it shall approximate to that of the divine kingdom. It accepts the nation, not as a human and earthly contrivance for certain temporal ends, but a grand fellowship for the establishment of the divine justice on the earth. And it teaches men to look beyond thrones and governments to an unseen King, the invisible center of the nation, whom alone we need fear, on whom alone we can rest our confidence for the present and the future of the land.

Thus theocracy stands opposed to secularism on the one hand, and to ecclesiasticism on the other. Secularism bids us look for no divine foundation

to human society, because none such has been laid. Ecclesiasticism bids us look for it only in the church, which it declares to be coterminous with the kingdom of God. The two are co-workers in the world both of speculation and of practical life. The secularist is the best friend of the ecclesiasticist. Teach men that outside the church there is no divine order, no divine authority, no abiding of divine power, and you give them over, bound hand and foot, to the rule of the priest. Then, when the priest has done his worst to degrade and corrupt national life, there will come a great reaction toward unbelief and atheism. Is not this the history of Latin Europe, in its vibration from extreme to extreme, from Our Lady of Loretto or of Lourdes to Voltaire and Renan? And our deliverance from "the falsehood of extremes" we owe to our grasp on the Old Testament truth of the sacredness of the nation, which Protestant Teutonic Christendom has maintained.

These universal principles of national life were illustrated in the public order and the history of the Jewish people, in spite of this being in many respects an intractable and unsuitable material. The "hardness of their hearts," the low stage of their intellectual development, was much in the way. The Mosaic legislation at many points had

to be contented with a very inadequate expression of the true idea, and with making large concessions to prevalent notions of right. Thus it did not always discriminate as to real responsibility for a crime. He who had killed a fellow-man by mischance was liable to be put to death by the next of kin, if taken red-handed. Even if he were pronounced guiltless of evil intent, he still was liable to be put to death if he left the city of refuge before the death of the high-priest. Any weapon or animal concerned in the death of a human being was destroyed, however valuable it might be.

But these were not new enactments of the Jewish legislator. They were merely the modified recognition of the universal usage of vengeance for blood which the Hebrews had in common with all the peoples of his age. The peculiar feature of the Mosaic law was the restriction laid on that practice by the establishment of the six cities of refuge, to which the innocent homicide might make his escape, and where he might dwell in safety if investigation proved that he had not acted with malice prepense. By this circumscription of the traditional usage the people were educated into the recognition that murder is the real crime.

The Mosaic legislation, however, stood high above ancient legislation generally in its recogni-

tion of the *lex talionis.* The exact adjustment of punishment to crime, "Life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth," the maxim our Lord is supposed by careless readers to reprobate while in truth he is giving it the highest sanction, underlies its adjustment of penalty to offense. Murder, for instance, is not regarded as an offense against the group to which its victim belongs. It cannot be atoned by a blood-fine paid to the group, or partly to the group and partly to the king. It can be atoned only with the life of the murderer, as a satisfaction to justice. So throughout the whole body of legislation there is such an adjustment of crimes to penalties as was possible in that stage of society,—the adjustment being frequently crude enough, but always calculated to enforce the principle that punishment is not primarily a social precaution, still less an act of personal vengeance, but a solemn atonement to justice on the part of the criminal. Thus the Mosaic legislation escaped those cruelties which grow out of the attempt to base punishment on utilitarian considerations, and to make it a great system of insurance of their possessions to the rich. The spectacle of a man hung for the theft of a sheep, or a child for taking a handkerchief, never was seen in Israel.

It is true that the death penalty was inflicted for

a much larger number of offenses than at present; and this was true of the ancient codes generally. Some of these death punishments are capable of justification even in modern society. Others belong to the stage before church and state came to be differentiated from each other, when—as Franklin shrewdly pointed out—many offenses against religion must be classed as high treason. But altogether the Mosaic code was not a cruel one, even though much of its severity is now impossible to us, and may be traced to concessions to "the hardness of their hearts."

It is to be remembered that judicial severities of this nature are not the whim of a legislative Draco, but the demand of the community, which never feels quite so virtuous as when it is devising the heaviest penalties for offenses to which it has a strong distaste. The English shopkeepers procured the enactment of the Draconian code against theft and shoplifting, which disgraced England for a century. The law against child abduction enacted after the Charlie Ross case in Pennsylvania is a more honorable, but not more wise, instance of this utilitarian severity.

It is notable that fines and imprisonments play no part in the Mosaic code. The Jews had no jails. Death, stripes and penal slavery were the

only penalties, and the accused was assured of a speedy trial because there was no place to put him in the meantime. He must be detained "in ward," —that is, in the personal custody of persons acting as officers of the law; but we hear of no place constructed for the detention of criminals. It was only under the kings after the division of the monarchy that this foreign luxury was imported into Palestine. As for fines, they were impossible in an age when coined money was not yet devised and bullion was extremely rare.[1]

In the teachings of the Old Testament, to have recourse to the machinery by which justice is obtained, was described as a seeking of God. "The judgment is God's" the people are told (Deut. 1 : 17). This is regarded as something peculiar to the Jewish nation,—as a feature of a theocratic system which existed nowhere else in the world, and is now a thing of the past. But in truth

[1] The students of prison discipline, and of its effect on the character of convicts, are discovering that imprisonment as a punishment for offenses against property is a mistake. It is not an application of the *lex talionis* in a way likely to bring that principle home to the conscience of the convict. And it tends to atrophy (by disuse) of the sense of property right in a class in which it is already weak. It thus almost makes sure that the thief will go back to his dishonesty. It would be far better to punish theft by fourfold restoration, as Moses did, and to compel the convict to set about earning the means to make restitution.

it was the common idea of all ancient civilization that the administration of justice was in the hands of the divine powers, and that law came to men from the highest source possible. The Greek king pronounced his decisions as judge by inspiration from Themis. The Roman king learned the elements of legislation from the nymph Egeria. Our legislatures invoke divine enlightenment from a less dubious source by the daily prayers of their chaplains. Our courts remind us that "Almighty God, the searcher of all hearts," is present and interested at the giving of testimony and whatever else pertains to the doing of justice. Taking an oath, indeed, is a solemn act of worship, prescribed and administered by the state, not the church, as an instinctive assertion of its theocratic relation to God.

Let us not, therefore, treat as exceptional in the Jewish history and constitution what it has in common with all others. The true distinction between the Jewish and the other peoples of antiquity was that it was the covenant people. It was living in conscious relations of obligation to God, who had disclosed himself in his unity, his holiness and his mercy, to it as to none of the rest. It was the custodian of the divine oracles, as Paul says. And even this—as the term used implies—was not for

its own sake alone, but that in the fulness of time all nations of the earth should be blessed. It was a covenant nation not only that in the fulness of time it might furnish the starting-point and basis for a new, universal society, but that the nations included within that society might become, like it, nations in covenant with God, elect peoples, nations to whom the kingdom of heaven should be given as a possession.

In mere externals of political method and constitution, of course there is a vast difference. And here we must take cognizance of a marked contrast between the ancient and the modern form of the state. In the ancient world the city was its normal form. Aristotle implies this when he says man is a political animal,—"political" being a derivative of *polis*, "a city." The Romans implied it when they classified mankind as civilized or uncivilized; the former being those who had attained the orderly, free life of the city, while the others live the tribal life of the open village (*pagus.*)

At first the transition no doubt was effected with but little change. The primitive city (*astu*) was a hill fort constructed by some tribe for its defense, and resorted to only in time of especial danger. Tribal and communistic arrangements gave way very slowly to those of a true body politic. As M.

Foustel de Coulanges shows us, they never were entirely superseded to the last. But in the main the closer relations of a city-dwelling population, with its greater variety of employments and pursuits, operated to differentiate the family from the state, to extend authority of local law over all the residents of the place, and to leave the natural family free to live its own life. Thus came private ownership, personal liberty, equality before the law, and a better established order of government than the tribe was capable of. It was in the cities of antiquity that not only the fine and coarser arts first attained a high degree of perfection, but the principles of jurisprudence and the methods of government were evolved by actual experience of the needs of free society. The roots of our jural and political culture are as truly found in ancient Rome, as those of our literary and artistic culture in Athens.

To Rome, under God, we are under unspeakable obligations. The profound legal instinct of the Latin race was providentially fostered in her by the demands of her position as a great center of commerce, and as an imperial city ruling over subject and allied cities. She was called of God to give laws to mankind, and she is still alive in the legislation of civilized nations. To her we owe

the conception of a political rule defined by locality, and not by kindred. From her we derive the conception of equivalence of penalty to crime (*lex talionis*) instead of a personal atonement as by a blood-fine to the friends of the person wronged or to himself. To her we trace the trial of accused persons by impartial jurors, who find their verdict on the evidence presented, and not on personal knowledge of the facts. To her we owe the inception and development of valuable personal rights, such as the right of testament and of contract. But above all we owe to her the great legal maxim which broke up tribal communism and established social freedom wherever the influence of the Civil Law penetrated: *Nemo in communione invitus detineri potest*,—"No one shall be held to common ownership against his will."

Ancient political organization hardly got beyond the city. In some cases the cities of a district united in a loosely organized league for the common defense. In others a great city brought other cities under its empire, and ruled over them as mistress. In Egypt, in Macedonia, and in Palestine, there seem to have been approximations to the larger life of the nation; but even there city life and organization played a part to which nothing in modern experience corresponds. Samuel bids

the people of Israel, "Go ye every man unto his city." The Psalmist describes the condition of the desolate: "They found no city to dwell in." And their deliverance: "He led them by a straight way, that they might go to a city of habitation." Ezra and Nehemiah both describe the return from captivity, "every one to his city." These expressions imply that cities were the living places of the Israelites, and were social units to an extent not true of modern society.

In the New Testament, villages are mentioned but thrice, once being in one form of the commission given to the apostles when they went out on their ministry. The greater security established by Roman rule probably fostered the habit of living in the open country, and in hamlets (*pagi*) away from the cities. But to the last the Roman Empire was little else than a world of cities. The city was so well recognized as the type of the body politic that it became a general term for an organized society. The Epistle to the Hebrews says Abraham sought for "a city that hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." John saw the new order of society coming down from heaven as "a holy city." Augustine of Hippo, when he would discuss the relation of the divine government to human disasters and calamities, writes "Of the

City of God," and contrasts this with "the city of man," or "the city of the world." And so in the history of the labors of the apostles we find them preaching the gospel to the cities of the ancient world, which were Christianized before the few dwellers in the country districts and villages (*pagani*) were reached by the word.

Our Teutonic forefathers, when they invaded and overthrew the Roman empire, were mainly in the tribal state as yet. They were not civilized in the Roman sense, or polished in the Greek. They confined the jurisdiction of their laws on lines of kinship. They were communists as regards the lands occupied by each thorp or mark, although they had made some progress toward the private ownership of other possessions than land. They treated murder as a civil wrong done to the group of which the murdered man was a member, and they recognized the right of private vengeance for the wrong unless a blood-fine had been offered and accepted. In all these things and in many others they were greatly behind the Romans they subdued; but they were apt pupils. By degrees they learned of Rome the principles of jurisprudence and organization, and in one respect they soon surpassed Rome and all the ancient world. By the principle of representation they laid the foundation of larger political

units than the ancient cities, without any surrender of the liberties of the individual, or rather, with far greater security for those liberties than had ever been dreamed of.

The principle and method of representation had no substantial existence in ancient politics. It is true that diplomatic representation was recognized in the old Greek leagues, but this merely in the limited field of decision as to peace and war. Legislation by a representative assembly was unknown. The laws of the ancient cities were either adopted in the assembly of all the citizens, or enacted by some limited class of them, according as democratic or aristocratic ideas prevailed in the civic constitution. Even league representation for common defense was unknown outside of Greece. When the government of Honorius, inspired by memories of the Achean League perhaps, tried to unite the cities of Gaul for the common defense against the inroads of the Germans, the plan proved a failure. The cities knew and would know of no civil authority between their local magistrates and the Emperor at Rome.

Representation at first was an idea quite as alien to Teutonic as to classic society. They too were divided into local, self-governing groups, which might be subjected to a monarchical power, but

which knew no middle term between local independence and monarchical subjection. But they possessed one political sentiment, which had died completely out of the classic world, if indeed it ever existed there,—I mean the sentiment of personal loyalty to their political chiefs, as distinguished from deference to the authority of an official. It was this loyalty which furnished the transition to the representative system, and made the modern nation possible.

At the outset the local group, under its own chiefs, exercised all the functions of government. It antedated the kingdom, even in the sense in which every shire was a kingdom. The mark-mote was a body at once legislative and judicial, although the relation of the people to their chiefs gave this a different coloring from the fierce democracies of Greece. When military necessity forced the coalescence of these smaller bodies into larger and more powerful units, the judicial functions seem to have remained in the hands of the mark-mote, while the power to legislate was transferred to the new body, the shire-mote. But the shire-mote was not in the same sense a gathering of the whole people. It consisted of all the chiefs of the district, of the free men of the locality where it was held, and of such other free men as found it convenient to

attend either on their own account or on that of their chiefs. Yet the personal loyalty which identified the marksmen with their chiefs worked to prevent any feeling of a defect in this larger assembly. They all were there because their trusted chiefs were there, and the act of the mote was accepted as the act of all.

This worked equally well after the unification of all the shires (or shire-kingdoms) into a single kingdom, and the transfer of the legislative power to a national assembly held at Winchester or Westminster. This assembly was still more imperfect as an assembly of the whole body of the people. Now not even all the local chiefs could be present. But the fact that trusted chiefs of each district, toward whom the people felt the attachment we call loyalty, had attended, and given their assent, was quite sufficient. The national legislature, in the phrase still in use, was "the Commons of England in Parliament assembled," and its authority would have been no greater if every free man of England had sat and voted on the measures it passed.

Thus the method of representation originated in a sentiment which we regard as altogether alien to it; and it is worth considering whether the method will long survive the extinction of the sentiment.

Not that the feeling of loyalty is extinct even from our politics. The strong personal following often controlled by political leaders even in America,—where the Whig maxim, "Measures, not men," is supposed to be accepted on all hands,—shows that we still are Teutonic in this great political instinct.[1]

The acquisition of the judicial power by the national government was a much slower matter. It long was felt that the avengement of wrongs such as murder was a matter for the kindred concerned, and that the natural remedy for wrong done in the matter of real or personal estate was distraint or distress exercised by the injured party, without the need of intervention on the part of the government. And as contracts did not yet exist, the necessity for a general regulation and judicial administration of them lay still in the future. By gradual encroachments often amounting to no more than local or temporary restraint on the exercise of vengeance or distress, the judicial

[1] Not only have we tried to dispense with loyalty, but we seem disposed to treat courage as a virtue of no social importance. The substitution of the ballot for open voting went a great way in this direction. The secret or Australian ballot is pressed for adoption to complete the change. The peace and righteousness of the divine kingdom will not come to us through those forms of secrecy, which our Lord repudiated as the children or grandchildren of darkness. The London *Spectator* says the Australian ballot has sown England broadcast with liars.

activity of the royal authority was extended, until the king's judges rode circuit in every part of the kingdom, and his assigned justices of the peace exercised the jurisdiction formerly possessed by local chiefs and elective county officials. Thus the peace became the king's peace, just as roads older than the unification of the kingdom became the king's highway. In this way the modern nation took its rise through the supersession of local legislatures by that of the nation, and of local executive and judicial authority by that of the nation's chief, the king.[1]

"The continuous process of history is in the nation," says Dr. Elisha Mulford in the greatest book of our political literature.[2] History is the biography of nations,—not of the whole body of mankind in all stages of arrested or of continuous development, but of those bodies politic which have not stereotyped their institutions, which have contributed a share to the common wealth of civilization, and which have influenced each other for good. In modern times this group of nations is all but coincident with Christendom. It is only the

[1] See "The Development of the King's Peace and the English Local Police Magistracy." By Professor George E. Howard of the University of Nebraska. *S. l.* 1890.

[2] "The Nation: The Foundations of Civil Order and Political Life in the United States." New York. 1870.

Christian nation that has been able to garner the experiences of the past—Hebraic and Hellenic, Roman and Teutonic—and to carry forward its development to still higher ends. It is within Christendom that history is not wasted and the past not barren for men, and this because we have learned to see in it the leading hand of the living God.

LECTURE V.

THE NATION AND ITS PROBLEMS.

It was Mazzini who defined the nation as a people with the will to be one people in distinction from all others. It is in the will of the people that the unity of the nation really lies. A nation may be such even when it is sundered under several governments, as formerly was true of Germany and Italy, or when—as in the case of Ireland and Poland, and formerly of Greece and Bulgaria—it is held by force under the rule of an alien government. It may be such even in spite of differences of speech, of race, and of religion, as in the case of Switzerland.

No external circumstance, no historical accident, constitutes or destroys the nation as such. It is not a physical but a spiritual fact, as are all facts intimately related to the human will. While it constantly seeks expression of itself in visible institutions and visible symbols, it is itself an unseen

unity. "The kingdom of heaven is within you," said our Lord. "So," added Frederick Maurice, "is the kingdom of England."

These symbols have their uses. They are the national sacraments, outer signs of an inward grace, and themselves a means of grace. George Eliot makes the old Florentine statesman speak of "the great bond of our republic expressing itself in ancient symbols, without which the vulgar—the *popolo minoto*—would be conscious of nothing beyond their own petty wants of back and stomach, and never rise to the sense of community in religion and law. There has been no great people without processions; and the man who thinks himself too wise to be moved by them to anything but contempt is like the puddle that was proud of standing alone while the river rushed by." So the nation's flag, its national songs and their airs, the relics and portraits of its departed chiefs, its high days of commemoration, the uniforms of its civil and military officials, the great edifices of its government, are all reminders of unseen facts, quickeners of the consciousness of national unity. Such also are the national language and the literature it embodies, and the national art, especially its architecture. All these are the manifestations of the national character, and bind the past to the pres-

ent, the near to the distant, in the consciousness of the people.

It is a matter of regret, although a minor matter, that we have laid aside the finest and the most appropriate symbol of national sovereignty, under the false impression that it belongs only to monarchical government. The throne, as the Jewish historian reminds us, was peculiar to the Jewish nation. All our discoveries in archæological fields have confirmed the claim: "There was nothing like it in any other nation." Elsewhere the scepter, the diadem, the parasol, the royal robe of purple and of gold, designated the sovran. In Judea alone his seat, by its magnificence and its permanence, symbolized the greatness and the permanence of the national order, of which the king was a part. Kings came and passed: the throne remained. It represented what in modern phrase we may call the constitutional character of the government, calling attention to the difference between this and the purely personal governments of the neighboring nations. It is therefore a more appropriate seat for the chief magistrate of a free commonwealth than for any king under the heavens.

Closely connected with this was the religious use of the term. The contrast between Jehovah and Baal was that the true God reigned from a throne,

on settled, eternal and revealed principles of order and righteousness. Baal was but another name for irresponsible and arbitrary power exalted to the highest conceivable potency, and owning no standard of right in common with mankind. There was nothing in his character to suggest Abraham's wonderful appeal: "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" Hence the exultation of Israel in Jehovah's throne as set fast in the heavens, in Jehovah as sitting on the throne of his holiness. And the figure passes over to the New Testament, where the Christian is bid to come with boldness to the throne of grace. Grace is not the shaking scepter, but the firm-set throne, the established order of the divine government. So John saw when the heavens opened to him in Patmos, and he beheld in the center the great white throne, and while lightnings and thunders formed the outermost fringe of it, in the center stood the Lamb that had been slain from the foundation of the world.

It was in these convictions of a just, orderly, holy government of his nation by God, that the Jew had the guarantee of personal liberty, of security in his rights, of safety from subjection to the whim and caprice of a despot. And, in the last analysis, that is the only safeguard of the liberties of any people. Our faith in constitutional devices, in the

balances and the checks of powers within the state, in the public responsibility of the rulers to the people, will all prove to be our leaning on a broken reed unless we have faith first of all in a living and liberating God, who hates the subjection of his children to slavery, who breaks all bonds that bind them, and who bids us "proclaim liberty throughout the land unto all the inhabitants thereof."

"Curses and arsenic will kill a flock of sheep," says Voltaire. A free constitution and faith in God will keep a nation free; but the constitution without the faith would be as ineffective as the curses without the arsenic. Bring a people into a slavish attitude toward the powers that control human life, lead it to believe that these are powers which would rather crush them than uplift them, that they find their best symbols in the storm and the earthquake, and not in the sunshine, the rain, and the dew, and the orderly recurrence of seedtime and harvest, and you have made that people fit to be the slaves of the first strong-handed master who claims their obedience. But put into a people's breast the conviction that God is the liberator of his people from the bonds of evil and from evil wills, and you have taught it to make a conscience of its liberty, and unfitted it to cringe and fawn before mere power. Hence the close relation

between a true, noble, free apprehension of God, and the liberties of the free people who cherish it. The battle for human freedom was fought by men who believed in God intensely, and who found despots small things because they themselves, like Elijah, stood before a living God.

I should not have said so much on this point, were it not that in our own times and through the spread of Agnosticism and Atheism, the liberty of the individual citizen is again brought into peril. Those who see no God behind the state are driven by a kind of spiritual necessity to exalt the state into a god, and to assert that in every case the will of the community has the right to override that of the single person.

The lower sociology tells us that conscience is the outcome of non-moral forces, chiefly of the pressure of society for the suppression of ideas and practices hostile to its existence or its peace. Right, in the last analysis, is what society judges to be expedient; wrong is what it deems inexpedient. Society being thus the creator of the conscience, its creature has no right of appeal against the decisions of its creator. And being confessedly an imperfect creator, itself advancing toward something better by slow and painful steps, the conscience is thus subjected to the absolute sovereignty

of a blundering and often a blind power. There is thus no absolute right, no standard of eternal justice to which an appeal may be taken,—no higher law than the statute which expresses the average judgment of the community. And it rests, therefore, entirely with the community to say what ideas and opinions it will tolerate in its members, and what it judges necessary to its own welfare to suppress.

We have been misreading history for these thousand years and more. Our sympathies have gone out to a Socrates dying for his loyalty to truth. They now are to be shifted to his judges, the saviours of society. We have felt our hearts throb and our eyes grow moist as we have seen old men and maidens, gently nurtured women and their children, cast to the lions of the Roman amphitheater for their confession of the name of Christ. We rather should have looked up to the Diocletians and the Liciniuses with admiration blended with pity for the hard necessity of seeming cruelty which their social position had thrust upon them. We have sympathized with Vanini, Galileo, Bruno, and the other "martyrs of science," who endured bonds and death in assertion of the truth their discoveries laid bare to them. Let us now belaud the inquisitors who stood for the only right Agnostic

science recognizes,—the right of society to suppress convictions it judges dangerous to the public welfare. Not the Covenanters on the hillside, flying from the brutal and bloody minions of a Stuart king, but Graham of Claverhouse, Grierson of Lag, and "bloodie Mackenzie," are to claim our admiration.

Indeed, Claverhouse's last admiring biographer calls attention to the new ethics, admitting that he cannot vindicate his hero on the old assumption that there is a higher law to which man may appeal against the statute-book, an absolute right which is independent of social enactments. But believing, for his own part, that that superstition is now moribund, he has no hesitation in saying that while Claverhouse's atrocities may be criticised in detail, his whole career needs no vindication. Torquemada, John of Capistrano, and Pontius Pilate, are specimens from the calendar of Agnostic sociology.

Assume that the state is an original, uncreated entity, that it owes nothing to the will of a divine intelligence at the heart of things, that its authority is original and not delegated by God, and you have laid the foundation of political despotism and of religious intolerance. In recent history the unbeliever in God has been one of a minority, and there-

fore obliged to plead for liberty. Skepticism and liberalism in politics have thus come to be as allies. But at bottom the skeptic is anti-liberal. He has no ultimate basis on which to establish the principle of toleration. He will be sure, if he ever should acquire the power, to use his power to suppress positive beliefs.

Every expression of certainty with regard to the unseen will be a source of danger to the Agnostic state, as tending to discredit it in the highest degree. The manifest impatience of the Agnostic with every exhibition of such certainty will take a much sterner shape when the power passes into his hands. As *The Pall-Mall Gazette*, in its Agnostic period, frankly admitted, the Agnostic state will have no choice but to forbid the expression of such certainty, and to punish those who disregarded the prohibition. The first centuries of Christianity and the French Revolution both furnish examples of persecution in the interests of negation.

It is true that persecution has been more usually in the interests of positive belief. But theistic belief is inconsistent with it; and the development of Christian society by the differentiation of the church from the state makes toleration logical. The faith that God only is the lord of the conscience is one which has taken root only within Christendom.

The Agnostic state would assail not only the individual liberty, but that of the family. In the family it sees nothing more than a natural arrangement for the perpetuation and increase of society. It could recognize no sanctity in the home, no authority of the father to conduct the education of his child except on lines prescribed by the state. Were it satisfied that he was using his paternal authority to train his child in the beliefs it regarded as superstition, it would remove the child from his custody with as much promptness as if he were training it in habits of theft.

The Agnostic state would dominate by its school system the whole intellectual life of its people, closing all schools but its own, banishing the name of God from its text-books, and creating in its hierarchy of teachers a clerisy of Agnosticism more intolerant and oppressive than any priesthood of the positive creeds. And this would continue until the outraged religious instinct of the race rose in revolt, and swept society back into the very superstition of priestcraft from which religious progress has emancipated us. Did I say Agnosticism would do these things? Both in France and in Italy, and even in some parts of our own country, it has used the control of the public-school system on exactly these lines and for these ends.

The Agnostic state thus would fall short of the very idea of a state. It would not be the institute of ideally existent rights, but the bestower of so many rights as it pleased upon its subjects. It could recognize no rights as natural, for it would regard them all as the creation of the society in which they existed. It might be progressive in the matter of attaining by degrees to a larger conception of the rights whose realization is beneficial to society.

But even this is very doubtful. As Vico says, a nation's conception of God furnishes the goal toward which it moves. Convert that ideal into a blank, even though it be a blank fringed with tints and colors borrowed from positive faith, and you have taken away the goal. China has stood still for millenniums because its real, its official creed is Agnosticism. Its "Sacred Edict" and the official commentaries on it pour contempt upon every faith which professes to disclose the divine to human vision. So the country neither has moved nor can move except by impact from without. Losing God, it has lost the ideal. The whole gamut of its art is embraced in the grotesque and the commonplace. Its social life has hardened into a cast-iron etiquette. Its political life is obedience to an earthly deity at Pekin, who himself is the chief and most abject slave of the all-embracing system.

The Christian state, in so far as it realizes its idea, is the highest form of the state because it most fully recognizes the antecedent lawfulness of the human rights it exists to secure. It sets the highest value upon man, and is therefore the most jealous of any needless restraints upon his God-given liberty. It proclaims that human brotherhood which demands for men equality before the law. Above all, it stands in vital relation to that supreme revelation of God which presents us God as the educator of man, the long-suffering father of mercies, the bestower of good upon both the just and the unjust.

The Christian state exists for the protection of all who exist within its boundaries in their rights of liberty, family, person, property and good name. Being embraced in an organic unity of life, it acknowledges its least and most insignificant subject or citizen as equally worthy of its care with the highest. Its public conscience is sensitive in this respect: if one member suffer, all the members suffer with it. Constitutional arrangements and restrictions may seem to relieve it of its responsibility in this respect. It may try to assert its freedom from responsibility for the liberty of a part of its people. But the public conscience proves restless under these restrictions. It is conscious of an

obligation or national brotherhood antecedent and transcendent of the constitutional agreements and compromises by which the nation professes to have relieved itself of the responsibility. Nor will it rest until the anomaly is removed.

So it was with American slavery. It weighed upon the national conscience, in spite of the arrangements to leave it to the states as a "domestic institution" of theirs. Men felt a responsibility for every slave on an American plantation, that they did not and could not feel as regards the slaves on Cuban and Brazilian plantations. They could not rid themselves of the burden. They had great faith in the obligations created by constitutions; but they also were forced to feel that there were national obligations which took precedence of these, and which no constitution could set aside. The conscience of other Christian nations reinforced this feeling by criticism; and when at last the peculiar institution was obliterated from our history, a great weight was lifted from the national mind.

For a nation is like a family in that it is a natural, and not a conventional, form of society. It is determined by its own idea, and not by agreements and arrangements among its people or the sections of its people. These arrangements are

harmless so long as they touch only the administration of affairs in things of convenience. But so soon as they amount to a restraint upon what belongs to the idea of a family, or to that of a nation, they become impossible. If a man agreed that his son should marry on condition that not his son, but himself, should exercise parental authority over children born of the marriage, the agreement would be unlawful, even though all parties had accepted it. It is the idea of the marriage relation as the institute of the affections which stands in the way, and which constitutes the deepest law for the testing of all such arrangements.

So with the nation. There is for it a deeper constitutional law than what it calls its constitution and writes upon parchment. It is the idea of the nation as the institute of rights, according to which constitutional arrangements themselves must be tested in the light of the national conscience.

As I have said, we have had one illustration of this principle in our own history. I am satisfied that it is not to be the only one. Our constitutional arrangements are still far from corresponding to the idea of the state. Ours is the only nation which does not possess full governmental power to protect its own people in their lives, liberties and possessions,—which abandons that protection to

local authorities, and gives them no right of appeal to national authority. This also is an evil which begins to burden the national conscience. The American people are restive in view of outrages on life and personal rights, for which local authority gives no redress. Let us see to it that the solution of the difficulty comes more peacefully and at less cost than did the emancipation of the slave. I do not speak here of what are called political rights. I recognize no such rights, but only political duties, which the nation may lay either upon the whole people, or—more wisely—upon that class of them it judges best fitted to discharge them. These, therefore, have not the universality of rights.

The relation of the nation to the right of individuals to hold property is one of the problems of our age. Property is assailed on every side, and defended as badly as it is assailed. To hear some of its defenders, one would think the state the chief servant of mammon, and the supreme end of the existence of society their own security in their possessions. From a Christian point of view we always must regard questions of property as subordinate to the interests of persons. If private property be recognized at all, it must be in deference to that higher expediency which has its end in the ethical development of mankind. Man is not made

for it, but it for man. It is not the purpose for which laws and governments are established. It is only incidental to those purposes.

In all considerations of this property right we must put the human side of the relation in the first place, and the material element second. This is not done when law sanctions the taking, or even the needless imperiling, of life in the defense of property merely. It is not done when the offenses against property are punished by the law with a severity out of proportion to their criminality. It is not done when, in the conduct of public affairs, the more human interests of the nation are postponed to measures contributing merely to material prosperity.

The form of property that is most called in question now is the ownership of land. The possession of a national territory is a necessary prerequisite to national life. The nation thus is popularly identified with its geographical area, and is spoken of commonly by the name of the country it inhabits. This is more strongly indicated in the modern than in the ancient form of the state, as the principle of local contiguity has superseded kinship in determining political relations. In the eminent sense, the nation owns its territory, has the sole power to alienate any part of it to another nation, and has

to determine under what conditions private persons shall have the use of the land.

In some nations this national ownership is maintained even in the economic sphere. The nation is the universal landlord, charging to the occupants a land-tax amounting to the annual rent, and making room for any new tenants it may wish to establish, without unjust disturbance of existing rights. Such countries are China, Japan and India. It is pleaded by a new school of land reformers that this should be the case in every country. They propose the nationalization of the land as a cure for the economic evils of our present situation. They would treat the present possessors as owners of the improvements actually made by human labor on the land in question (the earned increment); but they would levy a land-tax equal in amount to the annual value of the unimproved soil, and also to the additions to its value which are the result of labor expended in its vicinity (the unearned increment). In this way they would leave no inducement to own more than the owner could cultivate, and would throw open the rest to actual cultivation on terms as good as would be given to the present possessors.

Whatever may be said on economic grounds for such an arrangement,—and the example of the three

nations we have alleged is not very promising on that score,—it sacrifices more important advantages without any compensating gain.

Stable relations of the people to the soil, together with its diffusion among a large class of owners, certainly is the best political arrangement. Niebuhr says that "all ancient legislators, and above all Moses, rested the result of their ordinances for virtue, civil order, and good manners, on securing landed property, or at least the hereditary possession of land, to the greatest possible number of citizens." The Mosaic law endowed each family in perpetuity with a share in the national territory. It vested the ownership, not in any one generation, but in all the generations of the family, present and to come. Thus no present owner could alienate the family property so as to disinherit his posterity. All he could sell, even under the pressure of debt and distress, was the use until the coming of the year of jubilee.

The wisdom of this is made patent by the whole experience of mankind in the matter of land ownership. The first gain to the state is the settlement of its families on the soil, so that they shall take root in the homestead, be trained in the conservative mental habits fostered by fixed local relations, and acquire the social and mental independence

which attend the sense of having a recognized place in the community. As George Eliot somewhere says, it is a fine thing for a child to grow up with the feeling that the stars are an appendage to his father's house. Our land reformers would cut the tap-root of the family life of a majority of our people. They would convert land into a fluid kind of property, whose present possession would give no assurance of future enjoyment, and thus would deprive the representatives of the family of the motive to make those permanent improvements which tighten the ties that bind to home. Besides, the plan would throw a still heavier burden of taxation upon a form of property already overburdened, and would exempt forms of property far greater in value than the land, and demanding far more protection from the state.

Another set of reformers would have the nation take possession of the instruments and the machinery of production, either at once or gradually. This policy is advocated on higher ethical ground than is taken by the friends of the nationalization of land. It is argued that the system of individual enterprise and general competition has had a fair trial, and has proved a failure both ethically and economically. It has created a condition of economic inequality, in which the rich and the poor

are sundered in sympathy, and the ties of social brotherhood between them are broken. And it has produced in the industrial world a condition of private war, in which the strong crush and devour the weak, and the weak grow steadily more full of hatred for the strong. Thus the social environment created by the system of competition, it is urged, has proven morally degrading to all classes placed within it. To elevate men to a higher moral level, and to secure the equal welfare of all, we must extend the sphere of collective action until it embraces all the industrial processes of production and distribution. The Christian Socialists add that this industrial revolution is necessary to the realization of Christ's ideal of society, and to secure to men an environment in which Christian living shall be possible.

Communism proposed to establish equality by the equal distribution of the existing products of labor. Socialism reaches the same end quite as effectually and more permanently by confiscating the instruments of production.

We cannot deny that there is truth in the Socialist's indictment of our industrial and moral condition. The loveless competitions of the business world, the unbrotherly relations of classes to each other, the low level of business morals as exempli-

fied in adulterations, forestalling, stock-gambling, sham bankruptcies and the like, are things which shame our civilization. The whole relations of capital to labor are out of joint, and the public opinion of the nation is far from an attitude of fairness as regards them.

But after all has been said on that side of the account, one may be permitted to doubt if the picture the Socialist has drawn is either complete or fair. The modern industrial and business world is not a hell upon earth. If it were, it would soon work its own cure by producing social dissolution. The business commonwealth maintains its existence in spite of these evils, and by virtue of the truth and honesty there are in it. Business relations are based on man's trust in man, and continue only because the trust is justified by the results in most cases. Take one fact. Of the tens of thousands of outstanding contracts for the purchase and delivery of stocks, not a score were repudiated when the panic of 1873 fell and made most of them ruinous to one party to the engagement. Yet few of them could have been enforced by legal process.

Every business, every profession, every trade, furnishes its own temptations to those who are engaged in it, and thus supplies the means of

moral discipline to their character. It is true that the minority yield to the temptation and are found wanting. Shall we therefore abolish the discipline which calls many of the finest moral qualities into exercise, and content ourselves with social types of untried and feeble character? Certainly whatever can be done to make temptation less excessive should be done. There should be a steady effort on the part of all Christian men to uplift and purify the business, trade or profession, into which God has directed their steps, and to remove from it the moral traps and stumbling-blocks which beset the feet of the unwary. Especially is there need to invigorate that public opinion against wrong practices and demoralizing maxims, which we all find so necessary as a stay and support of virtue.

But to abolish the whole system to get rid of these temptations is—as the Germans say—to throw out the baby with the bath. It is as wise as the bear was when he smashed the fly on his sleeping master's forehead with a big stone.

And what warrant have we for supposing that the fly would be killed in this case? The selfish passions of mankind would not be extirpated by depriving them of one or of several of the vents they now possess. Whether we trace them to an original depravity of man, or to an inbred heredity

of a misdirected development, we must recognize that they lie too deep to be reached by any alteration of human environment. The assumption that they can be so reached is the prime fallacy of Socialism. This is why Darwinism, with its exaggerated emphasis on environment, has been so able an ally of the socialistic tendency, and has predisposed our age to lend an ear to socialistic theories. The two theories rest on this common assumption of the omnipotence of environment in shaping character. It is far truer sociologically that character gives shape to environment, and that social reforms must begin from a spiritual transformation.

If by a great revolution, violent or peaceful, but laborious and costly in either case, we were to get rid of private property by abolishing private production, we should find that the game was not worth the candle from the moral point of view. We merely would have driven selfishness to find other and yet more dangerous fields for its exercise; and perhaps we should look back upon the present order of society with a deeper sense of the truth in Dr. Johnson's saying, that "men are seldom more innocently employed than in making money."

Nor have we a right to forget what enormous sacrifices must be made to attain so small and

unsatisfactory a result. Individualism and free competition are not altogether lovely, but they brought us great benefits. They have developed human energy and self-reliance. They have given scope to human individuality. They have stiffened the human vertebra. They have accomplished for the enrichment of the human race in a hundred and fifty years more than Socialism in fifteen hundred years. "Better fifty years of Europe than a cycle of Cathay!" Above all, they made human freedom real, and put it into every man's power to make of his life what he would. They have made possible, partly by the removal of restriction on individual action, partly through the demand for victory over temptations, that richer development of human personality which is the glory of our civilization. They have left each man free to follow whatever vocation God laid upon him, while Socialism would bring society between him and his Maker, and would require of him to follow the demands of social opinion or enactment in meek submission. Socialism would effect the greatest retrogression in history, the abandonment of the best harvests of the past.

Yet Socialism is not here for nothing. It is, as Philip Boucher says, a subversive criticism of a subversive society. It has its message to us, for it

lays its finger on the sore places of the body politic, and says "thou ailest here and here." It has no real remedy, hardly more than a mitigation of the disease; but it discusses the symptoms with the eloquence of truth. The spirit of greed does far too much prevail in the industrial life of the modern world. It is the crying sin of our modern society. And no sin is more utterly alien from the mind of God, or more certain to close our hearts to any understanding of his true character. Besides this, it is a respectable sin, while other sins are disreputable; it is an unremitting sin, while others leave us alone for moments of self-disgust and shame; and it is an absorbing sin, which at last takes possession of the whole nature. But it is not a change of arrangements or methods by which that spirit will be cast forth. The remedy must go deeper than that. A new spirit, a higher moral life, a truer ideal of the purpose and end of business, are necessary before the evil will be remedied.

Upon you, gentlemen, who are, or are to be, the ministers of the Word of God, lies the first responsibility in this matter. It is yours to apply the maxims of the kingdom of heaven to our social problems, to proscribe the Mammon-worship of our times; to insist that use and service to persons, and not the gain of things, is the only end for which a

man may spend his strength in the toil of business, profession, or trade. It is yours not to exalt your own as "the sacred calling" in contrast to others as secular, but to proclaim that these others are sacred in their nature and intention as part of the divine order of human life. It is yours to warn men against the false standards of success and failure which the world obtrudes on us, and to insist that the only success is the daily and hourly consciousness of following the leadings of the Divine will in the service of our fellow-men. It is yours to hold up Christ's law of social ambition: "He that would be chief among you, let him be the servant of all;" and to insist that uselessness, not poverty, is the chief evil of human life, as the Lord gladly accepted the latter that he might come "not to be ministered unto, but to minister." It is yours to labor for the elevation of all professions, businesses, and trades, to the rank of liberal professions, as acknowledging a higher standard of success than money-making.

Above all, it is for you to insist that to each and all of us every person God brings into our lives, however slightly, shall be to us a person,—an end in himself, and not merely a means to some other end;—that our relations with them shall be right and human relations, and not those of mere con-

venience to us. Thus shall we each in our place labor for the prevention of that sundering of sympathy between rich and poor, the employer and the employed, which must be especially dangerous in a republic like ours.

And when we have brought this message of the kingdom to the consciences of the rich, we shall have a right to plead with the poor against the spirit of envy and bitterness which too often possesses their hearts, and which has its root not so much in the inequalities of human conditions as in the feeling that they are nobodies, *nithings*, in the view of society, and must expect to be despised to the end. It is the changed conditions of modern industry which sunder master and men, capitalist and laborer, that render an especial effort needful in this matter. When the two classes lived face to face, and toiled together in the same workshop, and even lived as neighbors in the same street, they came to an understanding. It is because they are sundered by stone walls, by wide distances, by social distinctions, that the class feeling and class resentments have taken root, and grown and spread among us to an extent which fits the social ground for the sowing of socialistic tares, for the evil message of hate, jealousy, and struggle.

The conflict of organized labor with capital in

our days is much more extensive than is the Socialist drift; but it is related to it as having the same moral causes and as requiring the same spiritual remedy. Here we need to be on our guard against class prejudices. There is good sense in the saying of Lord Derby, that the duty of the public, when a strike occurs, is to make a ring, and see that both sides get fair play. In the trial of strength and endurance which a strike involves, there is a disposition to assume that capital is always in the right and labor in the wrong. And the collapse of a great strike is hailed with exultation, as proving the futility of this plan of settling industrial difficulties.

Yet it is by trades' unions and strikes that the great improvement in the welfare of labor has been achieved, on both sides of the Atlantic, in the matter of raising wages and of reducing the hours of labor. It is not to the credit of the capitalist class that voluntary advances have so seldom been made by them in either respect. Nor does the failure of a strike always prove that it was unwise or improper. There are situations where a man owes it to his manhood to offer resistance, just as much as we owe it to society to appeal to the authority of the laws against the encroachments of lawlessness.

But we cannot accept this condition of armed neutrality, broken by periodical conflict, as the right and natural condition for the industrial classes of a Christian country. Even the lawful use of the power of capital or the power of associated numbers becomes un-Christian when it is animated by feelings the reverse of kindly, and when it implies in either class a denial of its responsibility for the other. This is not the kingdom of righteousness, peace, and joy predicted by Christ,

> Whose sad face on the cross sees only this
> After the passion of a thousand years.

And the way out of it must be in diffusing a more Christian spirit through both classes. It is mammon-worship in both that has brought the strife. It is the spirit of Christ that must bring us peace. The ideal of gain as the end of labor must give way to the ideal of use or service in both classes. The employer must come to recognize that his relations with his men are a part of his responsibilities before God, and that their welfare is a chief end of his own activity.

The laborer also must come to feel that the truest reward of his toil is not the wages he earns, but the consciousness of having served God in his daily work.

In this direction lies the way to social peace; and has the Christian Church a higher privilege than to hold up these ideals of service before men, not as obligations laid upon them, but as privileges, as the means to sweeter human relations, to lighter hearts, to more joyful lives? That is our American need. Ours is the country of least want and least happiness, travelers tell us. We fail of the substantial joys of life, that in Europe fall to the lot of the poorest. "We gather wealth, we gather care." The burden of our anxieties draws hard lines on face and brow. So hard a task-master is Mammon, who always puts off our satisfaction to to-morrow and its possibilities, and refuses us the content of to-day. As faith makes that ours which we have not, says old Quarles, so covetousness takes away that which we have. It robs us of the joy in it, the cheer of it. It sows strife among us, where Christ brings peace.

Covetousness is the sin of our age; and if social sins are to be cured by removing the opportunity to them, the Socialist has a very strong case for his remedy. But the abuse of a thing cannot be removed by the removal of the use. That way of cure would impoverish our human life, narrow the range of human ethical development, and convert our law into a system of "Touch not, taste not,

handle not," which could lead no one to perfection. The cure must come in another shape; and if it do not come at all, we may witness a great reaction against the love of possessions, such as the thirteenth century witnessed. It was in his father's well-filled mercer-shop, and while a young man of wealth and the brightest worldly prospects, that Francis of Assisi fell in love with poverty and took it for his bride. Before he died, myriads of every land in Western Europe had caught from him that passion for poverty which seems so strange to our modern world. Yet we may live to see a like outbreak of revolt against not only Mammon-worship, but the innocent things Mammon uses to ensnare our souls. The outcome of his experiment, however, warns us that it is not by such reactions that such problems can be solved permanently.

The demand of many of the working classes that the hours of a day's labor be reduced to eight or some smaller number is based on the belief that the invention of labor-saving machinery has made it possible for society to have all its material needs satisfied with a diminished amount of toil from the available working force, and that a change which would increase the number of workmen needed to do a given amount of work would be beneficial as tending to reduce the number of the unemployed.

As to the reasonableness of these premises, and the possible effect of the change on wages, prices, and international trade, this is not the place to speak. If these points can be settled in a sense favorable to the demand, then the eight-hour movement has great claims upon the sympathy of all who hope for a general amelioration of the condition of "the most numerous class—that is, the poorest."

The changes which have taken place in industry have deprived it of the educational character it once possessed, and have imparted to it a monotony formerly unknown. When a workman had to discharge a great many different operations, these helped to make his work an education in itself, and they imparted variety and interest to it. What has been thus lost must be made up in some way by intellectual employments in hours of leisure, unless we are to see each new generation of toilers more stunted in mind than its predecessors. And an industrial change which increases the leisure, and thus enlarges the possibilities of education, would be a good thing for society.

It is argued that the leisure given will be wasted in dissipation. Yet if society does not need the laborer's time, and can let him have it to himself, it is our duty to see that he gets it, whatever the use he will make of it. Nobody would think of

holding back money which fairly belongs to a man of mature years, because of a fear that he would spend it on drink, and not for his family. And of money, so of time. It is true that a reduction of the hours of labor, and an increase of leisure to the laboring classes, will increase greatly our social responsibility in the direction of helping them to facilities to make right use of leisure.

As the eight-hour movement demands legislation to enforce it, as well as seeks to bring it about through labor organizations, it has been denied by some that the state has any right to interfere in the matter. But the state always has been admitted to have the right to impose any regulation upon industry which it thinks necessary for the physical and moral welfare of its people, and especially of those classes which are least able to take care of themselves.

In most parts of this country where mining or manufacturing is conducted, the law already prescribes ten hours as the legal limit of a day's labor. When these laws were enacted, the factories were run from twelve to fourteen hours a day with the same staff of workers. And every state of the Union has a law limiting the days of labor to six in the week. The right to specify the days of labor certainly carries with it the right to limit the hours.

The laws which establish the first day of the week as a day of national rest from ordinary labor are a witness of the direct relation of the nation to God, just as the observance of the seventh day, before Christ's coming, bore the same witness to the Jewish people. The Commandments were given to a nation; the day of weekly rest which the fourth prescribes it requires of the nations. Nor is it for any arbitrary reason that this requirement is made. "The sabbath was made for man," and especially for that most complex form of man we call society. It is necessary to social sanity and physical health. It becomes more necessary with every generation. As the societary movement grows more rapid, and the excitements of business more exhausting, the necessity to furnish a balance and restraint to these in a day of common rest increases proportionally. And as toil becomes, through the division of labor, more monotonous, the laborer experiences this increasing need equally with his employer.

It is notable that workingmen of the Old World are coming to realize this need, and that the international conference to improve their condition on the continent of Europe so as to diminish their discontent, which the present Emperor of Germany set on foot, laid very large stress on securing their

exemption from needless labor on Sunday, as well as on proper restrictions on the labor of women and children.

The great enemy of the Christian Sabbath is Mammon. The eagerness to make gain at the expense of their brethren awakened in the Jews an impatience with sabbath observance, which Amos, Isaiah, and Jeremiah rebuke. The right of the poor to the day of rest was denied even by those who made their own observance of it a matter of religious ostentation. The same spirit exists still more powerfully in our modern society, and, if the keeping of the day be sundered from the divine ground on which the Commandment places it, no other defense will avail for it. It has very little honor in those countries, nominally Christian, which have turned their backs on the Old Testament. It will not hold its own among us unless we recognize that its observance is based not only on the Divine will, but on that Divine nature in whose image we were made. In the putting forth of Divine power the alternation of effort and rest, of change and permanence, finds the completest expression. To bring our lives into harmony with God's, there must be the same alternation. Work must be holy to us because he worked and hitherto worketh; rest, because he rested from his works,

and calls upon us to enter into his rest,—that Sabbath-keeping which he has in store for his children.

"The working classes," says Dr. Newman Smyth, "cannot sell their Sabbaths without selling that which is vitally essential to their physical and moral well-being. Society cannot compel or allow men to sell the time of the Sabbath day, and hope to preserve for all classes that measure of industrial independence, moral as well as physical, which is necessary in order that men may be fit for citizenship in a free state. Let the Sundays of laboring men be legally sold to factories and railroads, or let the Sundays of business men generally be surrendered, whether individuals will or not, to the general lust for gain, and the whole economy of modern life would soon settle into a hopeless, grinding, and most wasteful industrial slavery. Men must reserve for themselves, for their own uses, physical, mental, and moral, and for their home life, this much at least of time, if they are to remain freemen, if they are to be anything better than calculating machines in the office or hands in the shop."

LECTURE VI.

THE SCHOOL AND ITS PROBLEMS.

While sociology primarily occupies itself with the three normal forms of society,—the family, the state, and the church,—there is one social institution it cannot bring exactly under any one of the three, because of its intimate relation to all of them. This is the school,—using that term broadly, in the sense of including all educational institutions from the university down to the primary school for little children.

In some countries, the entire school system is in the hands and control of the state. In others, it is directed and controlled by the church. In one, at least,—Iceland,—it is identical with the family. But in spite of an exclusive legal relation to any one of the three, it will be found really to touch upon them all.

The education the Old Testament provided for was family training. Those elements of knowledge which were judged indispensable to the young

Hebrew he was to hear from his father's lips. The people were to teach to their children the great facts which explained and emphasized the vocation of Israel. Especially the Passover was to be an occasion of this. In the later Jewish literature, it is in the Book of Proverbs that we find most references to the training of the young, and still without mention of either educational institutions or a teaching class. The elements of this education are moral discipline and practical wisdom. The sciences are not mentioned as part of it, nor is any information given us as to topics of study.

When the synagogue arose in later Jewish history, it was an educational no less than a devotional center to the local Jewish community. Connected with each synagogue there came to be a week-day school taught by a rabbi for the benefit of the young. And the people valued these schools so highly that they spoke of the breath of the school-children as the life of Israel, and declared that not even to rebuild the temple should the schools be closed.

Nor was the instruction of persons of riper years neglected. The second service of the sabbath was the Beth-ha-Midrash, or "House of Research," where those of the community who had the knowledge, the gifts, and the weight of character, required in a master in Israel, sat to hear and answer the

questions put to them by the members of the congregation.

It was this Beth-ha-Midrash, as held in one of the courts of the temple, that our Lord was attending when his mother found him. And the use of it passed over into the Christian Church, and remained there in those first generations when the church still retained a distinctly Jewish complexion. Where the New Testament speaks of *doctrine* or of *teaching*, it is not the preaching of the Word that is meant, but this interlocutory instruction of the congregation by question and answer. Hence the Apostle's injunction: "Let the elders who preside well [in the Christian congregation] be held worthy of double honor, especially those who labor in [preaching the] word and in teaching."[1] But when the Church became Hellenized and Latinized, this usage ceased, the only remnant of it being the schools for the instruction of catechumens or candidates for baptism.

For the church's own sake there should be a revival of this educational work, which reached all ages and classes, and gave popular interest to church assemblies. It, of course, would make great demands on the tact and judgment of those who

[1] See Dr. H. Clay Trumbull's "Yale Lectures on the Sunday-school." Philadelphia. 1888.

conducted such meetings. But this would be well repaid by the return to a method used by our Lord himself in his teachings, as well as by the church afterwards.

In ancient Greece, in education as in everything else, Athens and Sparta stand out in antithesis to each other. In the former, the idea was to develop human powers of mind and body to the highest potency; while in the latter it was to repress individual desires and propensities by a more than military discipline. Each was successful up to a certain point. Each was a half-truth, whose halfness bore fruit at last in the ruin of the state. Christian education rests on a union of the two,—the repression of man's baser nature, and the development of that which is higher.[1]

In the early Christian Church, home training seems to have been the first dependence, as we find in the New Testament no reference to Christian schools. In the following generations, the Christians seem to have accepted the common schools of the Hellenic world, and their training in Greek literature, especially Homer, and to have transferred their curriculum to schools taught by Christians. When Julian the Apostate tried to

[1] See F. D. Maurice's "Has the Church, or the State, the Power to Educate the Nation?" London. 1839.

strike at the church through the schools, it was by forbidding Christian teachers to use Homer, Plato, Demosthenes, and the other great Hellenic authors, in their classes. It was then that Apollinaris proposed to supply this loss by furnishing Christian epics, dialogues, and orations in any quantity that might be necessary. After Julian's death, the old curriculum was restored, and remained in use among Eastern Christians till the overthrow of the Byzantine Empire by the Turks.

In the West, much the same kind of schooling seems to have been in use until the incursions of the Germans overthrew education along with everything else. It was Benedict of Nursia, the founder of the Benedictine Order (A.D. 525), who saved what could be saved from this deluge of the nations. After his time, education was a church matter. Even where civil rulers, like Charles the Great, were active for the establishment and extension of schools, it was in the monastic orders and in the clerical staff of the cathedral churches that they found the teaching force they required. Charles set up a *schola palatina* in his own palace at Aachen for the instruction of the young people whose parents held positions of any rank in his court. When he returned to his capital from his expeditions, he always had the school called up for examination, to find what

progress they had been making. Those who had done well were rewarded; those who had neglected their work were cuffed. And it was observed that the children of the courtiers generally came in for the latter treatment, while those of the servants got the rewards.

The Continent, in that dark age, was especially indebted to Ireland for teachers of exceptional learning and ability. "The schools in the Irish cloisters at this time," says Dr. Döllinger, "were the most celebrated in all the West. Whilst almost the whole of Europe was desolated by war, peaceful Ireland, free from the invasions of external foes, opened to the lovers of learning and piety a welcome asylum. The strangers who visited the island, not only from the neighboring shores of Great Britain, but also from the most remote nations of the Continent, received from the Irish people the most hospitable reception, a gratuitous entertainment, free instruction, and even the books that were necessary for their studies.[1] On the other hand, many holy and learned Irishmen left their own country to proclaim the faith, to establish or

[1] Baeda, writing of the great pestilence of A.D. 664, says: "*Haec autem plaga Hiberniam quoque insulam pari clade premebat. Erant ibidem eo tempore multi nobilium et mediocrium de gente Anglorum, qui tempore Finani et Colmani episcoporum, relictâ insulâ patriâ, vel divinæ lectionis vel continentioris vitæ gratiâ illò secesserant. Et*

reform monasteries in distant lands, and thus to become the benefactors of almost every nation in Europe." Of these emigrant scholars were Sedulius, the hymn-writer of the fifth century; Clement, who succeeded Alcuin as Charles's minister of education; John Scotus Erigena, who resided at the Carling court some generations later; Virgil of Salsburg, who scandalized the Germans by teaching the rotundity of the earth; Columbanus and Gall, who established, at Luxeuil, Fontaines, Reichenau, St. Gall, and Bobbio, monasteries which became unequaled centers of learning and of educational influence. Especially notable was the tradition of Greek scholarship and of Platonic philosophy which was preserved in Ireland, as is shown by Clemens and Erigena, and by the Irish Latin hymns.

Out of the cathedral schools were developed the universities, which we find in organized existence as early as the close of the twelfth century. The strict title was *studium generale*, as designating a school which had outgrown the limits of locality in its influence. The universities were church institu-

quidam quidem mox se monasticæ conversationi fideliter mancipaverunt, ali magis circumeundo per cellas magistrorum, lectioni operam dare gaudebant; quos omnes Scotti libentissimè suscipientes, victum eis cotidianum sine pretio, libros quoqve ad legendum et magisterium gratuitum præbere curabant" (*Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum, Lib. III., Cap. 27*).

tions essentially, and that of Paris—"the mother and mistress of all universities"—was the scene of a memorable struggle between the regular and the mendicant clergy for the control of this new source of power.

The revival of learning brought about a change in the educational system, by bringing the mind of Europe into contact with the literatures of Greece and Rome. The Reformation followed up this by establishing a similar contact with the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures. For centuries Europe had been living and walking by the reflected light of those four great literatures. Her civilization had its roots in the truths they embodied, but she knew them only at second-hand, as reflected by ecclesiastical literature and tradition. She now was bid to see for herself.

The curriculum of the universities was affected by the revival of learning, which was essentially a class movement of scholars and of literati. The Reformation appealed to and labored for the whole people, so it addressed itself to the improvement of the common schools. Luther had had a sharp experience of the evils of an insufficient supply of schools, and of the wretchedness of the medieval course of study. He had been obliged to wander from home to find schooling in other cities, sharing

in the wretched and painful life of the wandering scholars of his time, that he might spend years in mastering little more than the Latin grammar and the order of the church festivals. In 1524 he made his "appeal to the German cities, that they set up good schools;" and, ten years later, appeared his "sermon that people should keep their children at school," in which he insisted that the cause of the gospel would be lost unless the rising generation were trained in good learning and a knowledge of the Christian Catechism; that is, the Creed, the Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, and the two sacraments. The good work he did for Germany found its parallel in Scotland, where the parish-school system which has educated a whole people owed its existence to John Knox and his associates. The ideal of the Reformed Church—the open Bible in the hands of an intelligent Christian people—made the school question vital with its leaders and founders. Wherever they secured an influence, it was felt in the diffusion of education. The Jesuits, at the head of the Counter-Reformation, had no choice but to become educators in defense of their church. Both parties struggled for control of the youth of Europe, feeling that success in that meant control of the future. And the Jesuits showed themselves able educators. They prepared the first really good

school-books. They established some sound principles of pedagogic science; as, for instance, in their rule of promoting teachers downward. The highest classes were given to the youngest teachers; as they grew more experienced, they were allowed to take the beginners. And in their schools were trained some eminent scholars; Voltaire never ceased to speak with gratitude and respect of his Jesuit teachers. But their great fault, and that of Roman Catholic education generally, was their distrust of individuality, their effort to educate the pupil into mere membership in the great corporation called the Church.

We hear much, in our times, of the "conflict of science with religion" which characterized the period of the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation. Science musters its "martyrs" by counting as such purely speculative philosophers, such as Servetus and Giordano Bruno, whose murder in the name of religion is a painful chapter in the history of the Church. But we are not reminded that the theologians of Salamanca justified Vesalius in dissecting a human body, in the face of the outcry of his own profession against the sacrilege. Nor is it insisted upon that the truth that our system is heliocentric was discovered by a priest, and published by him with the aid of a Protestant pastor,

and that the scorn with which the Roman Catholic Church treated that truth was learned from the scientific world, including my Lord of Verulam.

That the interest in education and in learning was kept alive in Europe by the influence of the church is a fact "writ at large" on every page of its history. It is equally true of America. To the Christian churches of the New World we owe especially that support of the higher institutions of learning which has kept the Western republic from sinking to the level of the Transvaal, a race of Christian barbarians with no culture above the level of the spelling-book. From the foundation of Harvard College onward, it was the church's conviction of the need of a learned ministry, and the church's possession of scholarship in its ministry, which made the propagation of a taste for the higher culture possible to America. Even my own university, the first in America without any definite denominational connection, owed to the Christian ministry both the ablest of its teachers and the bulk of its students, and it recognized its close relations to the churches by giving the senior minister of each denomination a seat in its board of trustees, while the city churches every year took up a collection for its support.

It was when the difficult part of the work had

been accomplished, and the community had learned the lesson of the church's self-sacrifice for knowledge, that first individuals governed by no motive derived from the church's proper life, and then commonwealths, came forward as founders of new institutions, or of chairs and departments in older ones.

In this great service to the Republic our Presbyterian Church has borne a large part of the burden. Always and everywhere its ministry were the representatives of the higher education, and its most efficient promoters. The Ulster Presbyterian ministers, graduates generally of Glasgow University, who came to America during the eighteenth century, have not had full credit for their work in promoting the higher education in the Middle and the Western states. They constituted the only element in early Pennsylvania that was really alive to the importance of the higher education. They created that academy system which was formerly the honor of the commonwealth, but which was heedlessly swept away in establishing the common-school system under the law of 1834. Not only in the counties they had settled, but in those controlled by English Quakers, by the Germans and by New-Englanders, they awakened a genuine interest in sound schooling, the loss of which has

done much to throw the state back to a lower place than it once held in this respect.

In our later history, common-school education has passed generally under state control. It was found that the church schools were not numerous enough or rich enough to reach the whole population. It was felt that the rapid immigration of Europeans made an efficient school system of vital importance to the Republic. Without showing anything like the English regard for the vested rights of existing schools, the state established its own system, taxed the whole population for its support, and refused to spend any part of the school fund for the support of other schools than its own. In this way our school system has become a state system.

I think it open to question whether church schools would not be a better system. In taking this ground, I am not influenced by any view of the state which would unfit it for educating the children of the country in any subject which it is fitting that they should learn. The state is competent to teach what the church ought to teach. But the church, through its clergy, can bring to bear an authority in education of a highly ethical kind, which it is not easy for laymen to exert. It can supplement or replace the parental authority more readily than

a force of lay teachers. And it is less likely than they to be swayed by the intellectual fashions of the time and the place, less likely to accept as its divinity the spirit of the age, because committed to a preference for what Jean Paul calls "the spirit of all the ages."

Nor do we really escape from the narrowing influence of class in setting aside the church's ministry in educational work. We only create another class, more certain to be narrow, professional, and, in the long run, obstructive to sound progress. The teaching profession, in those countries of Europe in which the state system has been longest established, constitutes a new clergy, not behind any other clergy in dogmatism and intolerance, even while it claims to be pervaded by the "liberal" and the "modern" spirit. And those who are familiar with the teaching class in America, I think must be aware of the tendency to move in the same direction, to regard teachers as a distinct body governed by an *esprit de corps* of their own, and bound to act together against every opposing interest on the assumption that their ideas of the right and the fit are co-extensive with sound principles of educational policy. We yet may have a new clergy on our hands in America, and one whose numbers and unity may make them

as inimical to the public interests as any priesthood of any church could be.

The suggestion of church control of common-school education in America is a counsel of perfection merely, not because there is any inherent absurdity in the suggestion, or anything really alien to the temper of the American people, but because our ecclesiastical condition is one which unfits us for this as for so many others of the social functions of the Christian Church. Our rent and divided Christendom could not take direction of the resources and forces of elementary education without such a waste of both as we already see in the direction of the forces and resources devoted to the proper work of the church; and that the public would not endure. Such waste is already seen in the painful struggle of half a dozen sectarian colleges for the possession of some newly settled region which hardly could support one. It is seen in that rapid and reckless multiplication of academies, colleges, and universities, all over the country, which has driven many of them to seek patronage and support by measures which are copied after those of the commercial drummer. I am told of one Western school of the higher grade which has two agents always on the road, looking up pupils for the next year, each of them

furnished with sheaves of testimonials, photographs of buildings and class-rooms, physicians' certificates as to the healthfulness of the location, and the like. This spirit of commercial competition has been harmful enough in the intermediate and higher education of our country. It would not be tolerated in the public-school system. Before the Christian Church is entrusted with the direction of elementary education, she must be in a position to give ample guarantees against the wastefulness of sectarian rivalry.

There is another question which is often confounded with the preceding; it is whether the Bible and the elements of theological truth should be taught in the public schools. Those who answer this in the negative, who advocate a purely secular system of education, do so on one of two assumptions. The first is that the state is a purely secular body, which has no business with religion, and therefore cannot teach it; the second is that instruction in such matters, including the reading of the Scriptures, must possess a sectarian character, and should be excluded as an offense to at least the minority of the community.

I might assume that I already have met the first of these objections in the two lectures on the nation. In those I sought to show that the secularist theory

of national existence is false from the start; that just as truly as God made man, so truly did he make the state; that just as truly as he calls men to live in relations of covenant responsibility with him, he does so with nations also. This secularist theory of the state is a thoroughly un-American theory, in spite of the loudness with which it has been proclaimed as implied in our separation of the state from the church, and our perfect freedom of religious convictions and of worship. It is in defiance of American history, as any one may see who examines the declarations of our national authorities on the subject, from the Fast Day and Thanksgiving proclamations of the Continental Congress and the general orders of General Washington down to our own time. The only notable utterances to the contrary are found in the treaty negotiated by a deist with a Moslem state, and in Thomas Jefferson's refusal to appoint a national day of national thanksgiving.

This secularist theory is in defiance of the declarations of those state constitutions under which by far the greater part of the American people live. It is in defiance of the decisions of the national and state courts, which declare in substance that a tolerant Christianity is imbedded in the public policy of the country, and that whatever antagonizes Christianity

is illegal, as against public policy. It is in defiance of the solemn acts by which the national and the state authorities have invited the people of the land to return thanks to God for his goodness, or to deprecate the severity of his judgments by fasting and prayer. It is in contradiction to the public policy, which provides for the religious instruction of the soldiers and sailors of our armies, for that of the dependent classes in public asylums, and for that of convicts in our prisons. It is contradicted by the action, not only of Congress and the state legislatures, but also the great political conventions, in inviting ministers of religion to open their sessions by invoking the blessing of Almighty God. It cannot be brought into harmony with the practice of our courts, which make the rendering of a verdict and the giving of evidence an act of worship, by requiring of witness and juryman an oath "in the presence of Almighty God, the searcher of all hearts." It is in contradiction to that policy which President Grant inaugurated when he invited the churches of America to co-operate with the national government in "the civilization and Christianization" of the Indian tribes,—a policy whose fruits are his noblest monument.

In whatever direction we turn, we find the American people repudiating this idea that the

knowledge, the service, the kingdom, of God are the monopoly of the churches, and that all the rest of human life lies away and apart from him as a thing secular and profane. And the older, the more settled, the more thoroughly American, any part of our manifold country is, the more numerous will be found to be the marks that the separation of the church from the state means no sundering of the state from God.

Nothing could better suit any clerical or priestly caste, who desire to subject the state to church control, than this theory that the former stands in no immediate relation to the divine authority. From Thomas Aquinas onward, the secularist theory of politics—the notion that the state is a human and worldly device for temporal and worldly ends—has been the favorite doctrine of the ecclesiastic mind. A state accepting such an estimate of itself, and teaching that to its people, would be the ready-made victim of sacerdotal arrogance. Its finest symbol is the Corpus Christi procession through the streets of Madrid, which trampled on the national flag, as this was lowered into the dust by public officials that the priesthood and its acolytes might march over it.

Once admit that the church, and only the church, constitutes the divine kingdom, and you have

thrown an infinite weight into the scale in which it compares its importance with that of the state. And at the same time you have delivered a fearful blow at the state's efficiency for even what the secularist regards as its proper functions. It is because the background of the infinite is recognized more or less consciously behind all lawful human authority that men bow to it. The centurion was right when he told our Lord that his own position as an army officer, controlling the brute force of the soldier by the power of the word of command, enabled him to understand and believe in the unseen and divine power by which Christ was rebuking the disorders of the visible world and the bodies of men. Each goes out to the unseen and the eternal.[1]

[1] A modern parallel to the story of the centurion is found in Miss Elizabeth Peabody's "Reminiscences of Dr. Channing" (Boston: 1880), which I condense: "I made a new acquaintance in that year [1841-42], a young lieutenant of the United States army, who first attracted my attention by inquiring at my library for Kant's works in some other than the German language. In talking with him about this book, I was struck with his different cast and method of thought from that to which I was accustomed. He did not, as Mr. Emerson afterwards said of him, 'draw in our team,' but rather—referring to his marked and fresh individuality—seemed to be 'a special answer to special prayer.' . . . He told me himself that he had been commissioned at nineteen years of age, and sent to the Florida war; and he had just been permitted to return, because the surgeon of the army had pronounced him ill. . . . He had little literary culture, his reading having been largely Byron's and Shelley's poetry. 'Queen Mab,' he

Furthermore, the state has no right to exclude what we call religious teaching, but might more exactly call theological teaching, from its schools, as this involves a grave injustice to its own people. Every state has a theology of its own. It assumes that theology in its dealings with its people. That theology shapes and modifies all its methods, its institutions, its laws. A Moslem state has a Mos-

said, had been his gospel; and his theology also was Shelley's,—namely, that God is merely a complex of the laws of nature. But his life in Florida had brought him to deeper truth. He was lieutenant to the celebrated Captain Bonneville, whose Indian imperturbability of temperament, iron will, and despotic habits, made an immense impression on his imagination, and commanded his admiration. Captain Bonneville soon left him in command of a regiment of desperadoes, who were, however, condignly ignorant. . . . In the long intervals between short periods of intense military activity, he was alone in his tent with only his books and his thoughts. . . . In one of his meditations on Captain Bonneville's and his own power over his men, he said to himself: 'These men are governed not by the complex of my thoughts, nor by the complex of the laws of nature, of which they know nothing, but by *me*,—a self-determining force, a free spirit, a *person*.' And at once it flashed like lightning upon him, 'And God is behind the complex of the laws of nature,—a self-acting, free, supreme infinite Person, to whom all finite persons are responsible.' He rushed to his valise, and took out the Bible his mother had put into it when he left home, and, for the first time, opened it. He could not believe that it was by blind chance his eyes fell upon the words from Isaiah quoted by Christ in the synagogue of Nazareth on the day he commenced his ministry: 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me,' etc. As he read the words, he thought he heard a roar of artillery, and sprang to the door of his tent—to learn that the roar was within his own soul."

lem theology behind it; and it is logical and lucid enough to recognize the fact, and teach it in every school. It is part of the power of that system of half-truths and whole tyrannies that it thus lays hold of the young and indoctrinates them with its beliefs. And these beliefs determine the relations of rulers and ruled, of parents and children, of husbands and wives, of masters and slaves, of believers and infidels, throughout the whole social structure.

This is equally true of the Christian theology as pervading the Christian state, although the fact is less palpable because closer at hand, and also because Christian teaching is so much in harmony with all that is noble in our human nature as to excite less observation. Every part of our social order is a reflex of Christian ideas, and to exclude them from our educational system is either to exclude the teaching of social duty or to make that teaching so superficial as to be useless for every practical purpose. Secular education is a cramped, maimed, palsied education. It can never render to the state the service of impressing upon the young that reverence for the public order and the established authority which are the first lessons in good citizenship. Hence its unreadiness to enter the ethical field except in the most perfunctory way. Very little indeed of the teaching in our secularized

public schools goes any way toward fitting men for good citizenship. Even politics as a science is generally ignored, and the practical workings of the government are rarely and slightly taught. It is unusual to find a graduate of our schools who can tell the difference between a grand and a petit jury, or specify the steps of the process by which a criminal is brought to justice, or define even broadly the functions of any national or local official.

The secularization of instruction in the public schools is to cut off the children of the nation from contact with the deepest springs of its moral and intellectual life. It is to isolate all sciences from that fundamental science which gives them unity and perennial interest,—the knowledge of God. It is to rob history of its significance as the divine education of the race, and to reduce it perilously near to Schopenhauer's estimate, that it had no more meaning than the wrangling and strife of the wild beasts of the forest. It is to deprive ethical teaching of the only basis which can make its precepts powerful for the control of conduct. It is to deprive national order of the supreme sanction which invests it with the dignity of divine authority.

And this process is going on in every part of our country. The use of the Bible, where still enforced

by law, is made as perfunctory and as unimportant as possible. The school readers are being stripped of every passage which conveys a theological lesson or contains an allusion to God or a future life. The instruction in moral philosophy, where room is still left for any, is given a thoroughly agnostic tone. It really looks as though we were coming to the French regulation, which forbids the use of the name of God by the teacher during school hours.

This silent and insidious revolution attracts the less attention because it is favored and defended by a great body of religious people, who refuse to see the harm that all great interests are suffering from it. They assume that such teaching as I am advocating must be excluded because it necessarily has a sectarian character, and that the schools can be adapted to the needs of the whole community only by their secularization. They ask: "Are men to be taxed for the support of teaching from which they dissent? Would that be consistent with religious liberty? Must they be compelled to keep their children from the public schools, unless they agree to have them taught doctrines in which they disbelieve? Are not the church and the Sunday-school sufficient for the religious training of the young, even if the week-day schools do not attempt any such teaching?"

Now if any minority is to have the right to exclude from our schools the teaching of subjects to which it objects on principle, there will be left a very narrow curriculum. Thousands of good people agree with my friend Dr. Seiss in holding that the decimal system of weights and measures is an outgrowth of the anti-Christian spirit of the French Revolution, and that its propagation threatens to undermine the Sabbath laws and usages of the Bible and of the nation. Others hold, with my friend Mr. Coleman Sellers, that it is a thoroughly bad and unworkable system of measurements, whose general introduction into our workshops could produce only confusion. Yet both these opponents of the system are obliged to contribute to the support of schools in which it is taught, and they do not seem to be crushed by the weight of the grievance. Spelling is a large subject in our schools. Yet society is divided into two factions on the question, a minority urging its assimilation to current pronunciation, and the majority holding fast to the traditions of the language in this respect. Yet this large, intelligent, and enthusiastic minority are obliged to pay their share for the teaching of what they proclaim to be utter irrationality in itself and a burden to the child.

Another indispensable part of the school curricu-

lum is history. The British government, guided by Archbishop Whately, excluded it from the national schools and the Queen's Colleges of Ireland, on the ground that history could not be taught without giving offense to the sectarian sensibilities of the people. Even now a man may take the highest honors in the Queen's University for Ireland without knowing who discovered America, or who commanded the British army at Waterloo. As for his own country, he may not know the difference between Brian Boru and Brian O'Lynn, or be able to tell whether the battle of Clontarf was fought before or after the battle of the Boyne. And in all this the English rulers of Ireland showed their wisdom. The less Irishmen know of the history of Ireland the better for its rulers; and the more entirely all history is excluded, the safer the schools will be from raising sectarian issues.

It is just as impossible to teach history as it is to teach theology in a way which will suit everybody in the community, and avoid offending the sensibilities of every sect. Who will write an account of the rise of Christianity which will neither offend the Jew by what it says, nor the Christian by what it omits to say? Who will describe the Protestant Reformation without giving offense to either Protestant or Roman Catholic? Who will describe

the great struggle in England and Scotland in the seventeenth century without treading on the corns of either Presbyterian or Episcopalian? Who will treat of the early history of the thirteen colonies without offense to the religious sects to which each of them owes its origin? Are we to eliminate Tetzel's traffic in indulgences, the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, the Thirty Years' War, the Irish penal laws, and the French dragonnades out of our text-books because to mention any of them is to touch an aching nerve in the religious susceptibilities of our people?

I might show how the same principle of deference to the objections of a minority would operate to exclude other subjects, notably the physical sciences. I will note only that it excludes all teaching of mental science which is not thoroughly materialistic. Not only the irreligious materialists, but the Adventists, the Christadelphians, and other bodies of believers in annihilation, rise up in protest against any teaching which implies the natural immortality of the human spirit.

But to none of these subjects has this principle been applied. It is only the subject whose teaching is most vital to the welfare of the state and most important in the judgment of four-fifths of the American people, that is forbidden to the schools

by the outcry that the prejudices and preferences of the minority must not only be respected—to that we all are agreed—but must constitute the norm and limit of the action of the vast majority. Only here are we asked to give up the American principle that the majority rules, and to substitute for it the Polish *liberum veto* which paralyzed a government and destroyed a nation.

Be it noted here that what we ask to have taught in the schools is not the sectarian peculiarity of this or that party, but the commonly accepted faith of the American people. The entire success of the English board schools in sundering the two things proves that there is no impossibility, and hardly any difficulty, in keeping out sectarianism while teaching Christianity. Indeed, we need no better statement than that of Professor Huxley: "I hold that any system of education which attempts to deal only with the intellectual side of a child's nature, and leaves the rest untouched, will prove a delusion and a snare, just as likely to produce a crop of unusually astute scoundrels as anything else. In my belief, unless a child be taught not only morality, but religion, education will come to very little. I believe, further, that in the present chaotic state of men's thoughts on these subjects, the only practical method of not altogether excluding religion from

the education of the masses is to let them read the Bible, and permit the many noble thoughts and deeds mirrored there to sink into their hearts."[1]

But we are told that the Bible also is a sectarian book, and the Supreme Court of Wisconsin has shut it out of the schools of that state on that very ground. Whatever may be said or done in a state, three-fifths of whose people are natives of the continent of Europe, the supreme courts of those states which truly represent American opinion and feeling have ruled the contrary again and again. The Bible belongs to no sect. It is the common standard acknowledged as the supreme judge by Christians of every name. As President Bascom says, it is related to sectarian teaching as water to all other fluids. It is the basis of all, but has the specific qualities of none.

"But the Protestant Bible is offensive to Roman Catholics. If you insist on having it read by them, you should be equally ready to have the Roman Catholic Bible read by Protestant children in the public school." Here let us first remove a misapprehension. There is no Roman Catholic version of the Bible in the English language which has the

[1] This quotation is from a letter Professor Huxley wrote to the rector of St. Mary's Church in Bryanstone Square, London, when he was a candidate for a seat in the London School Board. I have condensed it by omitting irrelevant and controversial matter.

authoritative sanction of that church, or to which it stands committed in any sense. In a few instances the Douay version has been approved by some American bishop, with or without revision. But this is in so far their personal act that the sanction expires with their death or their resignation of their sees. The standing given by Pio Nono to the German version of Allioli has never been conferred by the Church on any English Bible.

Nor does the Douay version, apart from this want of Church sanction, stand on anything like the same footing as the Authorized or the Revised version. It is a translation, not of the Bible, but of a Latin translation made in the fourth and fifth centuries, and materially altered in the Middle Ages by men who had no acquaintance with the original languages of the Scriptures. It is an annotated translation, safeguarded by sectarian notes, lest the reader should draw inferences unfavorable to the Church of Rome. And while the English Bible is the standard of the English language, the greatest of English classics, a book so imbedded in the words and phrases of our literature that Shakespeare and Byron, no less than Milton and Cowper, are unintelligible to those who have no acquaintance with it, the Douay version bears on every page the marks of having been made by men whose long expatria-

tion and residence among foreigners had spoiled their ear for the rhythm of good English, and had weakened their hold on its vocabulary and its grammatical forms. On every ground it would be impossible to give such a book an equal standing with the English Bible in the work of education.

But this is a scientific question: What version represents the confessedly unsectarian original? If, in the judgment of the state, this is not true of either the Authorized or the Revised version, it has before it the duty and the right of employing the best scholarship to correct them. If it can do better than the English and American revisers,—and they represented every religious body whose scholarship entitled it to representation, except the Roman Catholics, who refused to take part,—by all means let it do so. We who advocate the Bible in the schools as a text-book for thorough instruction in theology, politics, ethics, and good literature, will abide by the result.

As to the sufficiency of religious instruction in church and Sunday-school, we reply that one of the first practical dangers of society is that the greatest truths that bear on human life shall come to be identified in the public mind with Sundays, churches, and Sunday-schools. We certainly are helping to that when we provide that the most

aroused activities of the boy's mind shall be divorced from those truths, and that the subjects of science, literature, and history, with which church and Sunday-school cannot deal, shall be taught him with a studied absence of reference to "the divine Intelligence at the heart of things." What is that but a lesson in the practical atheism that shuts God out of all but certain selected parts of life, with which the young man may have as little to do as he pleases? What would be the effect upon a child's mind of excluding studiously all mention of his earthly father from his work and play for five or six days of the week, of treating all his belongings and relations without reference to the parent to whom he owes them, and of permitting such reference only on stated times when they were declared in order? But the monstrosity and the mischievousness of such an arrangement would be as nothing to this scholastic taboo of the living God, to whom the child owes every breath of its daily life, who lies about it as a great flood of light and life seeking to enter in and possess its spirit, and who as much feeds its mind with knowledge and wisdom as its spirit with righteousness and its body with earthly food, in providing "food convenient for" it. Shall the school boycott him, whose very thoughts it is thinking after him in the

fields of science, of history, and all the realms of human knowledge?

Another modern problem of education is that presented by compulsory laws. It grows almost inevitably out of the state's control of popular education, that it should think of compulsion to use school facilities as the correlative of their creation by state action. And in our own age the drift toward socialistic methods, which so greatly modifies public opinion, tends to lead those who are interested in social problems, like this of the education of the masses, to have recourse at once to what should be their last resort,—the compulsion of law.

There are serious objections to compulsory attendance on school. One is, that it operates in a mechanical and unvarying fashion, which works hardship in many individual cases, and tends to foster social bitterness and discontent with the law. It is conceivable that it may be important for boys of school age to be earning something for the support of a widowed mother and younger children, and that this would be prevented by the law.

Another objection is that it relieves the public schools of the necessity of making their studies attractive to children. Much of the illiteracy and the dislike of school-going are due to the needless strictness of school discipline, and the failure to

adapt the studies to the real needs of the children. A boy who is all limbs and little brain is set down to keep quiet and preserve silence, and exercise nothing but perception and memory for hour after hour. What is strong in him finds no vent. There is no outlet for muscular restlessness.

Again, the studies are far too much divorced from the boy's life out of doors. He is not taught what would make interesting to him the objects which are constantly present to his senses. Neighborhood lore is the first need of the schools, but is neglected in town and country alike.

Compulsion sets the schools free from all necessity of making such improvements in method as would meet these needs. It drives the children like so many sheep into an enclosure, and bids the teachers work their will on them. A little effort to draw might have saved the need of driving.

Besides this, it tends to lower the discipline of the school. The blackest sheep come with the whitest, and, as General Booth alleges from his own observation, the effect is not whitening. Nor can a black sheep be expelled until his violations of discipline have reached the point which will justify a magistrate in sentencing him to confinement in a "reform school;" that is, in an educational prison, which is not called a reform school from

any effect its inmates produce on each other. Thus the compulsory attendance has its final background in the barred and grated windows, behind which boys of all degrees of viciousness are herded together, as criminals of all degrees of criminality used to be herded in our prisons, and with like results.

Instead of compulsion, I would propose home missionary work in the interest of education. Let the parents of untaught children be appealed to by all the natural instincts of desire for their welfare. Let them be helped, where help is needed, to clothe their children fitly; and let them be helped also to dispense with their labor in school hours, where this too is necessary. Let the rich come down to the poor in this matter, and help to close the yawning gulf of social separation by evincing a genuine interest in those who are less fortunate than themselves. I do not say that in no cases should compulsion be exercised; but they should be rare and exceptional, and such as call distinctly for the protection of the child against an unnatural kindred.

In many parts of America this education question has acquired a new importance through the rapid immigration of foreigners. The history of the Germans of Pennsylvania and of the French of Quebec warns us against allowing a great body

of our people to remain isolated from the nation at large by language, while it is isolated by distance from its mother country in Europe. Such a population loses touch with both continents; it neither advances with the related people in Europe, nor with the people of the land of its adoption. Yet the problem of effecting its assimilation in language and thought to the rest of the nation is one which often presents much difficulty. The utter failure of the German schools established for this purpose in colonial Pennsylvania by an association of public-spirited citizens, shows how easy it is to awaken race jealousies and social prejudices disastrously. What is to be done must be done gradually and patiently, and not in the way in which the English government has been trying to exterminate the Gaelic or Irish language by compelling the children to attend English schools. The effect is that children in the west of Ireland and in the Highlands have been compelled to learn mechanically the sounds of the English language, and to commit to memory the contents of English school-books, without acquiring the smallest perception of their meaning. To have real success we must enlist the sympathy and support of the foreign element, not to extinguish their native language, but to enable them to become a bilinguar people.

LECTURE VII.

THE CHURCH: ITS IDEA, ITS UNITY, AND ITS WORSHIP.

The lower sociology can get no farther than the nation. Having exalted that to the rank of an unlimited authority, it sees nothing beyond it, unless it be a unification of all existing states into a world-state, or a vague notion of a universal brotherhood of mankind.

Christian sociology recognizes the existence of an institute of humanity, which, however far short of its ideal, aims at nothing less than the unification of all mankind in a society which shall transcend all limitation of race and of nationality. This is the church.

Long before the establishment of the church in actual history, there were presages of its coming. It was foreshadowed in the special call of Abraham to be the founder of a nation which should be a source of blessing to all mankind, a national society

out of which was to be developed a universal society. It was indicated in the work of those Hebrew prophets who, like Jonah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, were sent to labor with other nationalities than their own. It was implied in the Messianic prophecies, which foreshadowed Christ as reigning over the whole human race.

That these predictions answered to a real need of human nature, which called for a wider brotherhood than that of the nation, was shown by the rise of those ancient empires which sought to gather all mankind under a single rule. It was not mere physical force which created such empires and held them together. It was the truth for which they stood that gave them vitality, the truth that human nature instinctively seeks brotherhood with the whole human race. It was the falsehood they united with this truth which led to their decay and fall,—the false assumption that this broader brotherhood must be realized by destroying and trampling down the nations, and by bringing men together within a single state, an institute of rights.

Of that empire which is best known to us, the Roman, we find that it was one of the most popular of governments in its beginnings. The uniform and spontaneous evidence of the inscriptions set up by the provincials puts that beyond reasonable doubt.

It put an end to the almost ceaseless local wars which had devastated mankind. It established peaceful trade and facilitated commercial exchanges through an area half the size of our country, and many times more populous. As time went on, however, it became a deadly weight upon the energies, the intellects, the spirits of mankind. It so exhausted the resources of its people by the taxes required for the maintenance of a costly military system that its whole peaceful population was "bound to the soil" for the benefit of the public treasury. Its final collapse under the pressure of Teutonic invasion was a grand liberation for mankind, even although the nations into which it was broken were far inferior to it in refinement, knowledge, law, and all we call civilization. As Hegel says, "Rome broke the world's heart before Christianity came to heal it."

The same human instinct that underlay the ancient empires has found vent in other efforts to establish a substitute for the church. Thus Lessing, in his dialogue *Ernst und Falk*, proposed to exalt the Masonic Order to that place, in an age when the Christian Church seemed to have fallen into hopeless discredit. And there is no doubt that this and other secret orders owe very much of their vogue with the churchless part of mankind

to their possessing the character of a brotherhood transcending national boundaries, which is essential to the idea of the church. Numberless have been the plans, efforts, and suggestions to reach the same result in other ways. Tennyson's "Parliament of Man and Federation of the World" is the poetic expression of an idea which has stirred the hearts of many philanthropic people. Cobden's wish to see the boundary lines obliterated from the map of Europe is an unconscious tribute to the church idea.

Such also are the attempts to obliterate the variety of the languages of the race, and to establish one universal language, whether English, or Volapuk, or some other. The same motive has prompted Socialist parties to seek the destruction of the national order, and the establishment, in its stead, of a universal fellowship, a brotherhood of man.

The race has become a broken race by the sin which sunders its members from each other and from God. Sin is the great isolater, and has been so ever since it sundered Adam and Eve from the Divine communion, and set Cain against his brother. Sin teaches every man to set up a false center to the universe, which is himself, and to deny its true centrality in its spiritual sun, which is God. Sin is the enemy of all human relationships. The family and the nation have to fight for their

life against it, because it paralyzes public spirit and chokes the flow of human affections. The final victory over it must be in the gathering of the fragments of a broken race into one brotherhood in a new Adam, the head of a new humanity. This is the last stage of social development, and the sociology which has no place for such conceptions as sin and redemption can get no farther than the beggarly elements of the science it professes to expound to us.

God has "made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he purposed in" Jesus Christ, "unto a dispensation of the fulness of the times to gather under one head all things in Christ, the things in the heavens and the things upon the earth." The gospel, as Paul understood it, does not reach its consummation in the redemption and sanctification of the individual Christian, nor in the formation of Christian families and nations, but in the reunion of the whole race, which sin has sundered, to a fellowship with God and with each other through Christ. Its consummation is in the divine kingdom, whose highest social expression is the church of the Lord Jesus Christ. That church is called out of all nations into fellowship with him and with each other. It is called into a divine life, whose new law of love and

self-sacrifice, the bearing of one another's burdens, finds its root in the sacrifice of Calvary for the sins of the world.

The church is not an afterthought. It is no accidental or superficial feature of the Christian dispensation. It is at once God's answer to men's highest aspirations, and the crowning result of his whole work for the redemption of men. Nor is the church a mere instrument for the perfecting of individual saints, as some have conceived it,—a kind of school to which we must go until we have learned its lessons, or a crutch we need until we are strong enough to walk alone. It is an end in itself, because it has a moral personality of its own. It is a spiritual finality, begun here and to be continued through endless ages, as the holy order in which the redeemed and the sanctified shall abide forever.

The church is not the mere aggregation of regenerate spirits, whose inward life contains no more than these bring to it of their own. It is a spiritual organism, which has a life antecedent to that of its members, and which contains more than is found in the totality of its separate members. Its members live by entering its life, and renouncing that selfish and self-centered life which made them mere spiritual atoms. We cannot understand the Christian's position unless we see in him one who

would be headless without Christ, and who is drawn to give up his own center of thought and reference, and to live not for himself, because Christ has died for him.

Very finely does Henry Brooke illustrate this by a natural analogy in a passage in his "Fool of Quality:"

"Every particle of matter has a self, or distinct identity, inasmuch as it cannot be any other particle of matter. Now, while it continues in this state of selfishness, or absolute distinction, it is utterly useless and insignificant, and is to the universe as though it were not. It has, however, a principle of attraction, whereby it endeavors to derive to itself the powers and advantages of all other portions of matter. But when the Divine intelligence hath harmonized certain quantities of such distinct particles into certain animal or vegetable systems, this principle of attraction in each is overcome; for each becomes attracted and drawn, as it were, from self; each yields up its powers to the benefit of the whole, and then, and then only, becomes capable and productive of shape, coloring, beauty, flowers, fragrance and fruits. This operation in matter is no other than a manifestation of a like process in mind; and no soul ever was capable of any degree of virtue or happiness save so far as it is drawn

away in its affections from self; save so far as it is engaged in wishing, contriving, endeavoring, promoting, and rejoicing in the welfare and happiness of others."

To get a soul off its own center, to bring it under the influence of a life that is not its own, is to enable it to enter into the harmony, order, and blessedness of the spiritual universe. It thus becomes in truth a member of the church of Christ, as sharing his life and molded by it. It is made alive unto God through him, shares mystically in the process of his life and death and rising again, knows the fellowship of his sufferings, bears about in the body his dying, and shares in the power of his resurrection from the dead.

It may be said that "all this is true only of the invisible church, that kingdom which is within us, and whose bounds and limits none can draw. It has little to do with these outward societies and fellowships we call churches, and its spiritual operation is not prevented or retarded by the manifold divisions of the Christian Church and their lack of visible communion with each other."

There was a time when I thought I could attach a meaning to this distinction between the visible and the invisible church, but I am no longer able to do so. My studies in sociology have made that

distinction unreal to me. It is true that, in one sense, the Church of Christ is an invisible body, and that, in another, it is a body which makes itself visible to us by various signs, sacraments, and assemblies. But this is just as true of every other natural form of society.

The unity of a family is not a visible unity; it is not tied to any of the tokens from which we infer its existence. Yet we do not think of making a distinction between the visible and the invisible family.

The unity of a nation is expressed in various national sacraments, in public edifices, in officials, in representative assemblies. But we do not therefore speak of an invisible and a visible nation. "The kingdom of heaven is within you," some one once quoted to Frederick Maurice in this connection. "Yes," he replied, "and so is the kingdom of England." So is the republic of the United States. The real substance of the nation's life is in the wills of its people, in the public spirit which binds them in one, and which subordinates private interest to the general welfare. Without this unseen basis, the outward tokens of national existence would become so many unmeaning farces.

But this does not make the visible unity of either family or nation, in so far as either can be made

visible, a matter of indifference, or justify any one in saying that so long as the affection of the one and the loyalty of the other are all right, it is of no importance what external sundrances may have arisen among their members. A German nation divided up among twoscore of sovran governments was a pitiful spectacle, and one which could have resulted only from princely selfishness, local jealousies, and other sins against the national order and the vocation of the nation. Even although, as the literature of the country showed, a sound German heart beat under all these divisions, yet they rendered many national functions and uses impossible. The world joys in their disappearance. An Italy reduced to "a mere geographical expression," with Bourbon misrule in the south, papal in the center, and Austrian in the north, we felt to be equally anomalous; and the claims of the Church of Rome to be the great witness for unity is fatally compromised by the fact that it was, and is, the chief enemy of Italian unity. To go back to the typical nation, was it no harm that its visible unity was rent in twain after the death of Solomon, and Judah and Israel were arrayed against each other?

So let us not shut our eyes to the grave evil of the sundering of the Church of Christ—the visible church, if you please—into the manifold divisions

which exist in this land and throughout most parts of Protestant Christendom. The language of the New Testament about such divisions is too strong, too pointed, too reproachful, for us to regard them as trifling and external matters, which do not stand in the way of the church's full exercise of its proper functions. Certainly they do stand in the way of its witness to mankind of the highest and broadest unity of which our race is capable. When we speak of the church as a witness to men that God is gathering all things under one head in Christ, is not the world justified in asking what serious sense we can attach to such words in our age, even if they did mean something in the times when the Apostle wrote them?

Equally do these divisions stand in the way of the church in that they certainly check the flow of that Christian feeling of brotherhood with all who have been made alive unto God through Christ, and therefore have been given us to love and care for as our own. There may be those who can love all those whom Christ loves as heartily as they do those who are thrown into association with them in the same religious communion. I think my dear friend, the late George H. Stuart, was a man who had attained to that grace; and no doubt there are others. But with the average man it is not so. His very

neighbors, those who are brought nearest to his own life by God's providence, and who, as Christians, have the highest claims on his affection and good-will, are often sundered from him by a sectarian wall of partition, which dispenses him with caring as much for them, and getting as much good from them, as if it did not exist. I have known of two sisters in our own state, both good women, who, for forty years, parted company every morning at their own gate, and wended their way to different churches, neither ever entering the other's place of worship.

I first realized the reality of this severance of Christian sympathy in reading an obituary notice of a Baptist minister in a weekly newspaper. It was well and simply written, so that one could not but get through it a vision of a true, noble, self-sacrificing Christian. And it flashed upon me: "Why should not this man be as much and as dear to you as though he had been a Presbyterian like yourself? Can these divisions, which stand in the way of that, be of God? Does not Christian love call upon us to break down these barriers?"

Besides this, the church's relation to divine truth is compromised by sectarian divisions. A sect is like a political party, in that it is tolerant of just so much truth as falls within its own lines. A truth

which the other party has got hold of, it must treat with suspicion, possibly with scorn, always in a partisan spirit. This party spirit stands in the way of each separate body of Christians learning the whole mind of the Spirit in his leading Christ's people into all the truth. It causes a wrongful perspective in the presentation of the truth, in that excessive stress is laid upon denominational peculiarities.[1] It keeps men from obeying the Apostle's injunction in this matter, to mind not our own things only, but the things of others. When we come to obey that, we shall ascertain what he means when he prays that the Ephesians "may be able to apprehend, *with all the saints*, what is the breadth and length, the height and depth, and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge." It never will be until it is "with all saints" that we shall come to that height of blessed illumination. It never

[1] In bygone days, the long services of the semi-annual communion in the Covenanter churches ended with a testimony-bearing sermon on Monday morning. The whole "religious world" was passed in review, and I am told that those who were afar off—atheists, pagans, Moslems, and the like—were treated with comparative leniency. It was as the preacher worked his way home that his blows gained in vigor; and, by the time he reached the Associate and Associate Reformed Presbyterians, the feathers flew! It is human nature to be on peaceable terms with one who differs from me by the width of the sky; but woe to the man who quarrels with me as to the right end at which to break an egg!

will be apart from the mutual help of all the saints and their varied insight,—never while you fence yourself off in your corner and I in mine.

The divided condition of the Christian Church stands in the way of its progress. Something may seem to be gained from the sharp competition of various sects for the possession of the home and foreign fields. Lyman Beecher is held responsible for the saying that "Adam and grace will do twice as much as grace singly." That statement may be true as to the *bulk* of the work done; but, as Professor Drummond says, God cares more for quality than for quantity, and his estimate is the absolutely right one. The half that comes of Adam's activity is more than balanced by the lowered spirituality of motive, and of operation depending on motive.

Besides, there is the loss of unity of effect on the bodies and masses outside the church, both at home and abroad. Is it wonderful that the Japanese find themselves perplexed and amazed by the importation of our sectarianism into that most promising of mission fields? Is it strange that they are unable to reconcile it with the teachings of the New Testament, and that there has arisen among them a demand for the unification of Japanese Christians upon the basis of the truths common to all the Christian bodies that have been laboring there?

I cannot, for one, withhold my sympathies from them, and I look with longing for the day when the same spirit shall pervade our American Christendom, and we too shall rise up to demand that the divisions imported from Europe into our Christendom shall come to an end in a national church of America.

I say the divisions we have imported from Europe. America often is stigmatized as the land of sects. It is true that we do produce a mushroom growth of small sectarianisms, which rarely outlive a decade; and that we have produced a great number of variations upon the discords of Europe. But the great and unhappy divisions of our Christendom, with hardly a single exception, are of foreign origin. We have more sects than Europe only because immigration has brought us every variety. Of some we now possess every existing specimen. We really have shown very little inventive power in the matter.

Our divisions are mainly of alien origin. They are European, not American; and the American spirit grows restive under them, and shows this at intervals. It did so after the War of Independence, when there were many indications of an increased spirit of unity. It has done so remarkably since the war for the Union. In that great struggle men

of all denominations were brought into closer spiritual relations than ever before. They worked side by side for the spiritual welfare of our soldiers, and for the relief of the wounded, forgetting to ask whether they were in agreement upon lesser matters. The experiences of those four years of fiery trial were such as robbed of their significance the divisions which had separated Christian men.

The result has been seen in the decay of polemic literature. Go back to a decade or two before the war, and see how Benjamin vexed Ephraim and Ephraim vexed Benjamin in return. See the piles of books, addresses, and pamphlets in which Baptist and Pædobaptist, Prelatist and Presbyterian, psalm-singer and hymn-singer, Calvinist and Arminian, paid their most un-Christian regards to each other. Recall the prominence possessed by the great debaters and controversialists in the churches of that time.[1] Then see, in contrast to this, how small now the volume of such literature, how infrequent the occurrence of such debates between the divisions of our Christendom, and how trifling and transient the interest they possess for us. Not that intellectual life and discussion

[1] Dr. James W. Alexander writes, in 1841: "My good old father, after spying out for threescore years, strongly maintains that there is less and less appearance of amalgamation among the Protestant sects" ("Forty Years' Familiar Letters," I., 343).

have decayed; but they no longer turn on such questions, but on others which concern the whole American Church, and which would lose hardly anything of their warmth and interest if all orthodox Protestants were united in a single fold.

This change is deeply significant. It shows that we have entered upon an era in which the old divisive issues have become distasteful to us, and that even where they are of such a nature as to deserve continuous discussion they are neglected for others. It shows that the true idea of the church as the gathering of all under one Head is gaining attention, and that the wrongfulness of sundering from the communion of any who hold by the one Head and are trying to depart from iniquity is increasingly felt.

Church and sect—what is the difference between the two conceptions? It is one which corresponds in a reverse way to the difference between empire and nation. The morality of a nation is to accept its providential boundaries, to respect its neighbor's landmark. The immorality of an empire is in its refusal to accept boundaries, its guilty purpose to extend its rule over all mankind by destroying the life of the nations. The morality of a church is to accept no boundaries, to aim at bringing the whole world within its brotherhood, to interpose

no barrier to the admission of any to its fellowship, which is not implied in the character of the church itself. The brevity of the first Christian creed, the simplicity of the elements of the sacraments, the natural and spontaneous character of the church's assemblies and its worship and government, all were expressive of this great purpose to bring back the whole world to Christ. That is its character still.

A church ceases to be a church and becomes a sect just in so far as it lays down any qualification for membership which excludes any one except by his own fault. It becomes a sect when it acquiesces in being the church of a social class, or the church of a specific temperament, or the church of a certain intellectual grade or character, or an organization to lay undue stress on some one idea to the destruction of the right perspective of Christian teaching. Then it has set up a middle wall of partition to keep apart those whom Christ died to bring together. Then it is undoing his work in so far as it is preventing that manifestation of the unity of his people which he himself speaks of as the means to bring the world to acknowledge his divine mission (John 17 : 21).

When we apply such a test as this to the condition of American Christendom, are we not obliged

to feel that every statement of the church's idea is a satire upon the actuality? Not that all our separations are without ground in truth and righteousness. Where the fundamental truths of Christianity are at stake, division may be imperative. But by far the greater part of the American people are found in communions which recognize each other mutually as sound on all the great doctrines of the Christian faith, and yet these stand as far from each other as any of them do from the small bodies of whom this soundness cannot be asserted. Ours is the most orthodox country of Christendom, and the most divided in Christian order. We can say our creed together, but we array altar against altar and pulpit against pulpit. We spend far too much of our strength and our resources, not in promoting the great things on which we agree, but in keeping alive the small things which divide us.

Not that our divisions are altogether devoid of a rational basis, and constitute a mere chaos of adverse opinions, as the Roman Catholic and the unbeliever often assert. There is a reason underlying this folly even, and God, who brings good out of evil, probably will use our very divisions to enrich the life of the united church he will bring out of them. The study of American church history has brought me to believe I can see a threefold classifi-

cation of our sectarianism which has a theological basis.

The first group I shall call the Patricentric denominations. They are those whose conceptions of Christian truth cluster around the thought of the Divine sovranty. They see in the will of God the everlasting ground of our salvation, and in the work of Christ mainly a removal of obstacles to its free activity. That will occupies the central foreground of their theological perspective. It is to them the direct cause of all that is excellent in man. And as the Father's will is disclosed to us in the inspired Word, and in the statements of Christian truth evolved from it, the book and its doctrines are especially dear to them.

They have great faith in the efficacy of the truth, which they believe to be the especial means God employs in saving men. Therefore they value clear, sharply defined views of doctrine, careful statements of Christian theology. These pervade their thought, giving to life a serious earnestness in a chastening and solemn recollection of the grave problems and responsibilities of human existence. Theirs is an intellectual faith, and their tendency is to convert the church into a great school of theologians. In the original sense of the word "worship"—the ascription of worth, the recognition of

saving efficiency—they above all things worship the Father.

The second group are those who apprehend Christianity rather as historical fact than as intellectual truth. They are Christocentric, not Patricentric, Christians. The great fact of the incarnation of the Son of God is to them the central reality. In that the Son of God laid hold of our humanity to unite it to God, to bring a clean thing out of an unclean. Of that fact the church is at once the fruit and the witness. Through it historically the means of grace have come down to us, each of them bearing the consecrating touch of Christ's hand stretched forth to save.

So it is less by apprehending revealed truth than by being found in the way of grace, by entering into the historic life of the church, by the use of the means of grace, that men—in their view—are brought to participate in the salvation which is in Christ. Ordinances, sacraments devoutly received, the beauty of holiness in the church's worship, are the means they insist upon. They are the enemies of squalor and of irreverence; they have an instinctive sense of a deep relation of beauty to goodness. The historic Christ occupies the middle foreground of their theological perspective. They especially worship the Son.

The third group are Pneumatocentric. It is the Spirit's work as the Lord and Giver of spiritual life, the quickener of right feeling, that they find to be central and fundamental. All else, whether forms of truth or forms of service, they regard as outward and imperfect. They bid men—as William Law says—take heed to their own hearts, for there they will encounter all evil, and there only will they meet with God and with all goodness. The one thing needful is the Spirit's work to make men holy.

They value, therefore, fervor of the spirit, and even its rapturous and ecstatic overflow, more than definite views of doctrine or gracious sacraments and beautiful forms. They have been the revivers of the church, the authors of its fervid hymns and books of ecstatic devotion, and they have given it many of its most saintly lives.

Let me not be understood to say that these three types are found in mutual isolation, and that everybody can be put under one or another of the three. I speak of them rather as dominant, but not exclusive, tendencies in the religious culture of our several denominations. Since the great awakening of 1740, the third of these types has profoundly influenced the other two, and religion has been given a character of inwardness which it had not possessed in anything like the same degree. So, since the

Oxford revival of 1833-45, the second type has influenced both the others to an extent of which we hardly are conscious as yet. It has fastened more attention on the historic and objective side of Christianity, has brought the Incarnation into far greater prominence in theology, and has made the subject of the fitting expression of the church's faith in architecture, worship, music and song, a matter of far livelier interest than before.

But "these three are one," and the future will see the Pátricentric, the Christocentric, and the Pneumatocentric elements blended and reconciled in a trinitarian church life, in which truth, grace, and unction will each obtain full and rightful recognition. We shall then emerge out of our practical unitarianism of various types and become trinitarians indeed. We shall discover that the uniting name is that into which we were baptized,—the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,—and that it is one name while it is threefold. We shall learn, as Coleridge says, to distinguish without dividing, and thus escape schism; and to unite without confounding, and thus escape heresy.

It is not, therefore, as bare and stripped of all that our own history has taught or accumulated, that we are to enter the promised land of unity and

peace. It is as those who have something precious to bring to the common wealth, and something precious to receive at the hands of our brethren. It is not by crying "Go to, let us make" a unity of the church, by casting away all that has been attained to, and erecting a new union sect on the ruins of the past, that the better time will be brought about. It is by faithfulness to our own vocation, even by abiding in the calling wherewith we are called, by prizing (as a blessing finally intended for all) the goodly heritage that has fallen to us, and by watching for the divine leadings to a higher and better state than as yet we have reached. It is by watching for the divine openings towards union in the spirit of the words of the Puritan mystic, Peter Sterry:

"Let all that differ in principles, professions, opinions, or forms, join to see that good which is in each other, and the evil in themselves. . . . Unite the good which is in you; so shall the good on one side make up that which is imperfect in the good on the other side, unto a perfection of good in both. . . . Thus while the evil is the privation, the loss of yourselves, and the good your true selves, you will meet like the two halves of each other, filling up the circle of each other's being, beauties, joys,—and now be completed in one."

The social functions of the church must be defined and understood in the light of the idea of the church. It is not the only worshiping body, but its worship differs from that of the family and the nation in possessing a universal character. In its congregations men meet as men, on the ground of common need discovered and common help obtained. There is common confession of universal sin, common invocation of the help offered to all, common acknowledgment of the divine approach to all in the Incarnation of Christ, and in the mission of the Spirit. And in all rightful church praise there is the voice of the Christian congregation exalting God for his mercies bestowed upon all its members.

There is need of stress upon this, because in much of our service this distinctive character of church worship is ignored. Instead of the Christian congregation, the individual and what he gives and what he gets in the service are brought into the very foreground. Both in our prayers, and (especially) in our hymns, the individual emotion is treated as that which calls for utterance, and the ups and downs of individual "experiences" are a large element in our books of praise. Surely church worship should have a tendency to lift people out of this private and circumscribed range of

feelings into the vision of the great objective facts of our faith. The closet has its place in the development of the Christian life, but let it not open into the church.

Our worship fails of being church worship not only because we have a livelier sense of our individual selves than of our unity in the body of Christ, but because we come short of a true sense of its purpose toward God. We come to get good to ourselves, to be galvanized for a while out of our deadness, and not to glorify God. We want to have our feelings warmed and excited, rather than to rise to fellowship with angels and glorified saints in the unearthly work of praise. Mr. Baring-Gould reminds us that in the wilderness Moses took the things the people could do without for the construction and furniture of the tabernacle. From the women of the congregation he took their mirrors of polished bronze, melted them, and made the great brazen laver of them. And, as he says, we also carry our mirrors of the unseen sort, in which we always are seeing ourselves reflected; but they ought to have been melted long ago in the fire of love to God.

The Church of Rome aims at expressing this universality of worship in the use of a single ecclesiastical language in all lands, and in liturgic

forms which are everywhere the same. But this is to purchase a symbol at far too high a price, by the sacrifice of the substance. It is to ignore that consecration of national languages which the Spirit wrought at Pentecost, when men did hear each in his own tongue the wonderful works of God. It is to establish practically a clerical worship apart from that of the Christian congregation, the devotions of the latter running parallel to the prayers of the Missal or the Breviary, but not being the same. The conception of "common prayer" which the Reformation brought in is of vital importance here. Minister and people must pray and praise together.

One reason why we fail to realize the congregational character of worship is because we have sacrificed congregational freedom of expression to dignity. A modern church of almost any name is painfully and oppressively dignified in comparison with the kind of church portrayed for us in the Epistles to the Corinthians and other parts of the New Testament. Then they assembled and got together. Now we assemble, but hardly get nearer to each other than in a street-car. The modern preacher says his say, and nobody interposes a question. The primitive and even the medieval preachers had to answer questions put by their hearers · and,

to judge from some I have found in medieval sermons, the preacher needed to have his wits about him.[1] Such a pulpit was no "coward's castle"—to use Frederick Robertson's phrase. It was a pulpit which might be called to explain and defend its own statements. And this gave the audience a sense of being something, of having an active part in the service, which is now lost.

Another loss has been in the substitution of preaching at the second service for the teaching or "doctrine," which at the first occupied the afternoon. Dr. Trumbull, in his "Yale Lectures on the Sunday-school," shows both that the Jewish synagogue laid great stress on interlocutory discussion, and that, where the words "teaching" and "doctrine" occur in the New Testament, they refer to this method of public instruction by the free interchange of questions between the congregation and its elders. It was at just such a service in the temple that Mary found our Lord "sitting among the teachers, both hearing them and asking them ques-

[1] Thus in the sermons of Nicolaus of Strasburg, preached in the fourteenth century, one is on the story of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16). It is noted that one of the audience interrupts the preacher with: "Sir, how had Lazarus a finger, and the rich man a tongue, and yet a spirit hath neither flesh nor bone?" (Pfeiffer's *Deutsche Mystiker*, I., 265.) Such questions, with the answers, I find frequently noted in the reports we have of medieval sermons, and this shows to what a late period the apostolic freedom lasted.

tions." A second service of this kind would make great demands on the tact of those who conducted it, but it would tend to attract those who have been alienated from the church by the feeling that Christianity, unlike every other topic of social interest, cannot be discussed, and who think this is because it has nothing to say for itself. It would make instruction much more interesting to all classes, since —as Dr. Trumbull says—it is easier to preach than to teach, but harder to listen than to learn.

Woman's place in the service of the church is a topic of special interest to the sociologist. There are two distinct classes of women who are recognized in the New Testament as holding an especial place in church order. The first of these are the widows,—aged and godly women who were unable to support themselves, and were destitute of those relatives on whom they might depend in their declining years. Of these the church took care, requiring nothing in return but their supplications and prayers for the welfare of their fellow-Christians.

This class must have come into recognition very early, as we find that, in the very first years of the church in Jerusalem, "there arose a murmuring of the Grecian Jews against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministra-

tion." To prevent unfairness or neglect, the apostles called upon the congregation to "look out seven men of good report" to undertake a service which afterwards was called the diaconate.

Was the diaconate confined to men afterwards, as in this origination of the office? Of course, it is not to be inferred hastily that any use of the term *diakonos*, in connection with a woman's name, suffices to prove that it was. The word was used very freely to designate any kind of church official, or even the most general sorts of Christian service, as when our Lord says: "He that would become great among you, he shall be your servant (*diakonos*);" or, in Mark, "last of all, and minister (*diakonos*) of all." Indeed, there seems to be some reason to believe, with Archbishop Whately, that "deacon" or "minister" was at first a term applied indifferently to all the officials of the church, and that those we call deacons were distinguished by the title "younger" (*neōteroi*) to distinguish them from the elders (*presbuteroi*), and that the application of the term "deacon," especially to the former, came into use later.

But the description given in the sixteenth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans of "Phœbe, our sister, which is a deacon of the church at Cenchrea," and also what is said of the proper character of the

women deacons in 1 Timothy 3 : 11, seems to me sufficient proof that the office existed in the apostolic church. This view is confirmed by the first glimpse we have of the condition and methods of the Christian Church through the eyes of a pagan onlooker. Pliny, writing from Bithynia within twenty years after the death of the Apostle John, speaks of having arrested and tortured two women, *quae ministrae dicebantur* (the Latin equivalent of deaconess), to ascertain what was the truth as to the practices and beliefs of the Christians. From that time, in church literature, we find mention of the office as well established and recognized, and even as conveyed by ordination to those who were admitted to it. It finally died out when monasticism had effected the great perversion of the social order of the church, and holy idleness had come into higher esteem than Christian activity in good works.

The female diaconate existed to furnish scope for woman's energies in the widest fields of personal service, and to associate the two sexes in this field, so as to secure the highest efficiency from the union and co-operation of their contrasted qualities. It gave scope to woman's tact and adaptability in the care of persons, without thrusting her into those public modes of service which are reserved for man.

The demand for its revival comes with the new awakening of the women of Protestant Christendom to the opportunities there are for their employment in the work of the church. But it is too often associated with the monastic notion that women who are admitted to this office are not to be officers and members of a congregation, but are to create for themselves a community life outside of it,—a sisterhood which is not that of the church itself. With this is sure to come, and indeed, in the Anglican sisterhoods, already has come, the still worse falsehood of spiritual brideship as the vocation of the woman who has entered this artificial sisterhood, and thus has renounced family and social ties. It comes as the justification of that renunciation, and to fill the void in their affectional nature which is thus created.

The erection of artificial brotherhoods and sisterhoods of this kind has been a great source of spiritual weakness in the Greek and Latin communions. Is our Protestant Christendom quite free from it? It is true that we have nothing of the vows of "poverty, celibacy, and obedience," on which they have established theirs. But do we not show in other ways our half-confessed feeling that the church, as organized by Christ and his apostles, is not equal to the task it has undertaken, but

must be supplemented and bolstered up by voluntary associations of human contrivance? "What is your church at now?" some one was asked. "Busy organizing societies to do its own work," was the answer. Indeed, it might fairly be asked what there will be left for the church to do when we have got to the end of organizing a fresh association to provide for each of the social and spiritual wants of the people, and for the classes which make up society.

Each of these societies stands for a relinquishment of some part of its proper field by the church. The church is, or should be, a temperance society, a Bible and tract society, a city mission, a young (and old) men's (and women's) Christian Association, a Society of Christian Endeavor, and all the rest of it. As an association of all ages and both sexes, and of people of all degrees of enthusiasm and culture, the church inevitably must do its work with less *éclat*, and sometimes with more friction, than will be found in an association formed by selecting some one class from its membership. Yet, in the long run, it will be found that church work is that which wears best, is the least adulterated by human admixture, and confers the most lasting benefit on the whole body by enlisting all kinds of capacity and all sorts of gifts.

The natural mixture of society, which we find in the family, the nation, and the church, is the most wholesome for all of us, and for all the purposes of the kingdom of God. He who devised it was wiser and kinder to us than are they who seek out some special class to discharge the functions of either of the three normal forms of society. Sooner or later, these artificial forms will find that they are making the problems of our social life more difficult than they were before. And the analogy of monasticism is a warning that artificial associations created to lift up society to a higher spiritual level, just because they were organized on other than the natural lines of human association, come to be dead weights on the spiritual energies of society. The history of monasticism is a story of "reformations" made necessary by the insidious growth of laxity in the observance of the rule. That ominous word "reformation" makes its way into the literature of the church through the labors of Bruno the Carthusian, Robert of Citeaux, and other "reformers" of the Benedictine Order. Francis and Dominic set up their rule of mendicancy to keep out the contamination of wealth. But both their orders and the related order of the Augustinians soon stood in need of "reformations." Luther and his friend Staupitz were employed in enforcing the "strict observance"

of the Augustinian rule on the monasteries of Germany, when he was called to effect a grander Reformation than any in the monastic life. It was in the interest of strict observance that he had made his journey to Rome five years before the "Theses on the Virtue of Indulgences." Luther the Reformer had no use for artificial brotherhoods, monastic or other. He found full satisfaction for his social instincts and his religious zeal in the Christian household, the Christian nation, the Christian Church. He organized no associations for the promotion of God's kingdom, nor did the other Reformers do so. They turned their backs on the Kalands, the Fraternities and the Sodalities of the Latin Church to throw their strength into the advancement of family, state and church. Not until the first love decayed, and the first point of view was lost, do we hear, in the second half of the seventeenth century, of the appearance of such associations for special objects on Protestant ground. And not until our own century did they attain proportions which raised questions as to their general influence.

The evil fruits of our variety of artificiality may not appear as yet very distinctly. We are still on the threshold of this era of associations. It will require time to test their workings fully, and in the light both of sociological principle and of historical

experience I can speak only words of warning and deprecation.

It is a favorite argument to contrast the zeal and efficiency of these associations with the lack of these qualities in the Christian churches. The boasts of the early Franciscan historians as to the rapid extension and the zeal and efficiency of their order read not unlike paragraphs we find in modern reports. But it might be asked—in both cases—whence came these zealous people? They were the zealous element subtracted from the church itself, and deducted from its life and energies. It is not with a church thus depleted, but with one discharging all its normal functions and in possession of its normal forces, that a fair comparison might be made.

What these social functions are I shall try to show in my concluding lecture.

LECTURE VIII.

THE CHURCH: ITS SOCIAL PROBLEMS.

In the church God crowns the edifice of human society. There is nothing in social development above or beyond it. It is the fullest realization of human brotherhood that is possible in this world, and it is to carry forward its existence into the world beyond death and the resurrection. It is the meeting-point of the human with the Divine, as the body whose head is Christ; it is the meeting-point of time and eternity, as the gathering under that Head of all that are on earth and all that are in heaven of our redeemed race. It is the high-water mark of the moral and spiritual development of man, since it requires and consecrates the virtues of the family and the nation as preliminary to itself, and evokes yet others in the life of its members. It is the greatest safeguard of the life of both family and nation, since its life of divine renewal penetrates and sustains these no

less than itself. In a certain sense it may be, and is, called the kingdom of God, even while it is bearing most effectual testimony to the truth that that kingdom embraces the family and the nation as its integral parts.

It is its relation to these other forms of society, and to the social problems which arise within them, that I ask your attention in this concluding lecture.

As I said in the introductory lecture of this series, we are awakening to the fact that the church's problems are social problems. The age of mere individualism is passing away in religion as in other things. We have no need to hasten its departure. A more urgent need is to guard against the excesses and extravagances which are sure to attend that, and to save for the coming age the good which Individualism brought us, and which is endangered by the transition to an age of what has been broadly called Socialism.

One good thing of the new age will be a truer and higher appreciation of the worth of the church itself. The value of the individual Christian life, the inestimable worth of personal regeneration, the greatness of those experiences in which man and God meet face to face in a solitude as of the wilderness, are lessons which we especially associate with the name of that great and good man

the centenary of whose death occurred while these lectures were in progress of delivery. But Wesley's notion that Christian fellowship might put on any shape that was suggested by the expediency of the moment, and according to the private judgment of any religious leader who felt the responsibility of the care of souls, was quite inconsistent with the recognition that there is a natural and normal form of church order, and that our business is to discover the laws which determine its nature, and to obey them. Thus, I believe, we shall be brought to discern a unity underlying even our confusions and divisions, and, by acting on that discovery, to make the church a social power in this land and throughout Christendom, such as she never could be in the age of Individualism.

For my part, I rejoice that the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church have called us to the consideration of this problem, although I find neither in the Scriptures nor the earliest Christian Fathers, any warrant for an episcopate exalted above the actual care of men's spiritual necessities; and I can see no successors of the apostles in officials whose very position shuts them out from the pastoral work to which the apostles gave themselves,—the preaching of the Word of God and "the cure of souls." I would ask our

Episcopalian brethren to consider the first significance of that crozier, which once was the symbol of the episcopal office, and which points them back to the age when the bishop was the actual shepherd of the people of his parish (*paroikia*), and—as their favorite Ignatius reminds them—was expected to know by name every person under his care and oversight. If they have any equally fruitful hints for us as to the logic of our own system, I hope we Presbyterians shall have grace to "suffer the word of exhortation."

Sure I am that Christian unity is not coming through the discovery that any of our religious bodies is going to be found to be Moses' rod, with a divine right to swallow up all the rest, as being the rods of mere magicians. The proposal of the House of Bishops is notable as indicating that the expectation of that is ceased in a quarter in which it once was especially cherished.

A reunited church of Christ will be a grand blessing to society, as making it possible for the church to discharge many of its proper functions, which its divisions have obliged it to abdicate to the state or to voluntary associations. One of the most notable of these is the care of the poor and of the dependent classes. It was the Christian apprehension of universal duties of humanity as

embodied in the story (a law case rather than a parable) of the Good Samaritan that first gave rise to the conception of charity.

It is true that there is an external resemblance of the idea to the practices of Buddhism, but it is only external. The Buddhist performs an act of self-denial as a means to save his own soul. He gives as readily to the wild beast as to his fellow-man. He has no recognition of the human race as such having any claim on him. He and all sentient existence are bound equally by *dharma*,—the law of merit and of demerit. He and all other sentient beings must find escape from it by the same path. One step in the path is almsgiving, and it is to be practiced without any reference to the effect of the alms on the recipient. The idea of giving so as to help and uplift another is wanting altogether. It is not the least matter that giving may help a man to live a life of idleness and vagrancy, while a life of honest work would have been far better for him. The object of the giving is not to be of service to him, but to achieve a spiritual gain for yourself. In fine, Buddhism is the most thoroughly selfish of creeds under the show of the greatest self-sacrifice.

Not much better is the almsgiving of the Moslems, which betrays its character in the require-

ment that its amount shall be determined not by the needs of the wretched, but by the income of the true believer. Up to a tenth of his income the Moslem must give, whether there be worthy recipients of his gifts or not. Beyond that he need give nothing, whether his neighbors are starving or not. The necessary result is that every Moslem country has an army of idle, lazy, filthy fellows, who live on the alms they have no claim to, and are vastly worse than if they were obliged to live by their own labor. It therefore is hardly to be regretted that Moslem rulers so frequently insist that they themselves are the poorest and most deserving objects of this misdirected charity, and that they exact the alms-tithe as a tax for their own treasuries.

In some countries where Christian teaching on this point has been but half understood, these un-Christian ideas of almsgiving have prevailed and do still prevail. In Roman Catholic countries people are taught to give in true Buddhist fashion for the good of their own souls, and are forbidden to examine too closely into the real needs and claims of the beggars who apply to them. It is assumed that, "in the judgment of charity," those who ask help are really in need of it; and he who would go behind the asking to inquire into the

need, would be thought a very bad, hard-hearted Christian. Romanism, indeed, exalts the virtue of charity much above what Dr. Newman calls the pagan virtues of truth and honesty, on which Protestants lay equal stress. Hence the flood of beggars to be found in Roman Catholic countries, from the mendicant friar to the street-corner impostor, the former serving as a shield and sanction to the latter. But, as Dr. Whately well said, the errors of Romanism have their root in our human nature, and the same mistaken views of the nature of Christian charity both exist and work their mischief in Protestant countries.

The Christian ideal of almsgiving for the relief of the poor is to be sought in the words of our Lord and his Apostles. It is one aspect of that stewardship of our possessions which the New Testament everywhere teaches explicitly or assumes implicitly. And the purpose of this stewardship being to bring men, through their possessions, into sympathy with God, the gauge and standard of our gifts to our needy brethren are to be sought in the methods of his gifts to us. First of all, there is the delicate generosity of his gifts, in that he seeks out our wants without our having time to declare them, and makes provision for them before we are conscious of them. Then there is

the abundance of his gifts, which suggests no law of tithes as bounding our responsibility. He who spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, stopped at no tithe in enriching our need. How shall he not also with him freely give us all things? And, above all, there is the aim in all his gifts, to lift men out of their miseries, instead of simply relieving them in their miseries.

Therefore we find in his gifts a preponderant regard for the great things of life as great. He treats no human being as a creature of back and stomach wants only. He puts foremost the needs which belong to him as a man, rather than those he shares with the animals, and seeks to evoke in him the human and spiritual needs and virtues, which reckless giving ignores.

In his gifts, however, there is not that discrimination between the deserving and the undeserving poor, which our modern reformers make so much of, and which corresponds to the spiritual principle of the Pharisees. He recognizes in the undeserving the most needy of all. But on the other hand he has refusals and denials in their proper place. While he sends his rain on the evil and the good, and makes his sun to shine on the just and on the unjust, he can leave to hunger and want those who will make no use of rain and of sunshine in honest

labor, when they have the power and the opportunity to work. As Paul interprets the divine order in this respect, it means: "If any man *will* not work, neither let him eat,"—a law of the highest charity and mercy, but one which is much overlooked in our administration of His gifts to us.

It was these principles which bore so wonderful a harvest in the early Christian Church, that even Julian the Apostate was obliged to hold the Christians up to the admiration and imitation of the pagan world. Nor had the pagan world been unmoved by it. As Edgar Quinet (in *Le Génie des Religions*) observes, Roman legislation in the period between the time when Christianity began to be felt as a social influence, and the time of its establishment as the public faith of the Roman world, was characterized by a growing regard for the needs of the poor, the helpless, the distressed. We find the names of some of the worst emperors attached to laws of a broader humanity than the best legislators of the commonwealth period could have thought of. It is to Christianity indeed—as Horace Binney showed in his eloquent defense of Mr. Girard's will before the national Supreme Court—that we owe the very conception of a charitable trust. And it was through the institutions of the church that charity was dispensed through all the

ages of Christian history down to the seventeenth century.

It was in the England of that age that the idea of a public provision for the poor at state expense was brought into practice. It was the frightful growth of the pauperized and dangerous classes through the expropriation of the small farmers, that suggested some such remedy. And from England the public work-house or almshouse was brought to America, and so widely established that we have come to regard it as a law of nature almost, an indispensable part of our public order. Yet the greater part of the civilized world has managed to get on very comfortably without it.

The state, as the institute of rights, can give nothing to any man without conceding that it is his right to have it. Therefore, the state is the worst possible dispenser of alms. Every dollar it spends on the relief of the poor, is an admission that they have the right to be supported at the public expense, whether their need be due to idleness and improvidence, or to a blameless failure to succeed in life. Every such expenditure is an admission of the principle laid down by the Socialists that the state is directly responsible for the well-being, not only of the community as a whole, but of every individual in it. When Louise Michel,

the French Socialist agitator, paid a visit to England, she told a London audience that there was one English institution, not found on the Continent, which commanded her hearty approval. It was the poorhouse! The existence of a public institution for the indiscriminate relief of the poor, she saw to be a concession of the essential premise of Socialism.

State relief of the poor cannot but be indiscriminate and degrading. The state, at its best, has a wooden uniformity in its operations, which unfits it for dealing with nice problems such as this. It cannot treat individual cases discriminatingly. It must treat all on the basis of equality, without much regard to merit, motives, or equity. For this very reason its gifts are felt to be degrading to the recipient. It can show no delicacy in bestowing them. It can pay no regard to the spirit in which they are received. It is as far as possible from the spirit of that divine law of Christ, to which it is paying the respect of the letter when it makes any provision for human wants of this class. Therefore, it is felt everywhere that the work-house stands next to the prison in the disgrace it inflicts on its inmates. England forced the institution on Ireland in 1835; and so great is the horror of it that, in 1882, people actually died of hunger on the west coast, rather than enter the poor-house.

The defects of state relief of the poor has been so widely felt, that voluntary associations have been formed in every part of the English-speaking world to supersede as far as possible the need of applying to it. Many of these have been so thoughtlessly managed as to add much to the difficulties of the problems they intended to solve. In our own times there has been a reaction against them, which has taken shape in the Charity Organization Societies of our great cities. In our present condition of spiritual disorganization, these societies are probably the best organs we possess for the administration of charity.

It is noteworthy that when the first Charity Organization Society was established in London, in 1868, Sir Charles Trevelyan, in the inaugural address, declared that they simply sought to apply to the situation of affairs in that great city the principles Dr. Thomas Chalmers had applied with so much success in St. John's Parish, in Glasgow. If you will read Dr. Chalmers's own statements in his early pamphlets in his lectures on the subject before his theological classes in Edinburgh, and in the second volume of Dr. Hanna's biography, you will find that he simply was standing up for the old Scotch system of relief to the poor through the officers of the parishes and congrega-

tions, against the English system of public state relief, which Glasgow and other Scotch cities were beginning to introduce, and which also had crept into the shires near the English border. Dr. Chalmers was not insensible to the example of the more numerous and wealthier people in other matters. In this matter, however, he was convinced that Scotland had nothing to learn from England; and that, even in the great cities, where the parish machinery had gone to pieces almost, it was quite possible to resuscitate it, and to make it effective for the care of the poor. His Scotch thrift was impressed with the fact that the expense of caring for the poor on the English system was vastly greater than on the Scotch; not that the assisted poor were better cared for in the big barracks of idleness miscalled work-houses, but because the number that needed to be cared for increased rapidly when a great fund for the purpose was in sight. He therefore persuaded the town council of Glasgow to isolate St. John's Parish from the rest of the city, and to permit him and the officers of the congregation to take entire care of its poor. He managed to show them that the parish system worked better than theirs.

From the coppers collected at the church doors in the evening, when the poor came to hear him,

he made all the provision needed for the poorer still, while from the richer contributions of the morning he built and supported parish schools. He and his deacons made a close investigation of every case that came to them. If the needy person had relatives who fairly might be expected to assist them, these were asked and urged to do so. State aid had been a mighty solvent to sunder the ties of kinship, to quench the affections of the family, to suppress in the poor themselves the instinct of self-reliance and self-respect,—to convert them into paupers. The parish system was made to work in exactly the opposite direction. It sought to evoke, under the highest sanctions, the charities of social life, to awaken in men the sense of mutual dependence, to lead to sacrifices for those who were still more needy.

Above all, Dr. Chalmers avoided awakening the cupidity of the needy by accumulating a great relief fund, and making the access to it an easy one. There was not much to be got in St. John's Parish, and it was not over easy to get it. People were not taught to say: "If there is anything to be had, I may as well have it as any one else." There was no encouragement to false pretenses and culpable idleness. The only thing given lavishly was personal and friendly encouragement to self-reliance

and self-help. "Not alms, but a friend," was the maxim of the administration, and the poor were the better cared for in not being treated as animals with animal wants, but as human beings, with social ties and duties, and a social honor to be sustained equally with that of the rich.

The system was thoroughly Christian in its severity and in its generosities. It was right in the line of Paul's injunction to let a man starve who will not work when he has the strength and the opportunity. It was Christian in its emphasis on the sacredness of social ties and obligations; it sought to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the children to the fathers. It was Christian in recognizing that the highest and the truest giving to the poor is not the gift of food, clothing, and money, but of yourself. I have said it was an inexpensive system as to its money cost. But it was expensive beyond example in its personal cost,—in the number of good men and true required to work it, and in the demands it made on their time, their attention, their moral force. You can judge of the scale on which any scheme of help for the needy stands by this single quality, Does it make great demands on men to give themselves to their brethren? If it does not, the Christ-like element is wanting in it, and its success can only

be of the low order of which mere machinery of any kind is capable.[1]

Such a method of charitable administration as this is confessedly impossible to the state. It cannot deal with the finer shades of human existence by any machinery at its disposal, and therefore it can only demoralize where it means to help. The sooner it goes out of the business the better. Its almshouses and work-houses and poor-houses are nothing but a rough contrivance to lift from the social conscience a burden that should not be either lifted or lightened in that way.

What is to take the place of the public relief now paid for by taxation? At present, the work is in the hands of voluntary associations of various degrees of intelligence, the best being the Charity Organization Societies, and the worst the soup-houses (with a few exceptions) and the medical dispensaries (with no exception known to me). We have come to recognize that just in so far as any such associa-

[1] This principle finds an especial application in dealing with a class poorer than the poor,—the fallen women whose sin and misery is a reproach to our civilization. All kinds of remedies for "the social evil," as it is justly called, have been tried; only one has succeeded. It succeeded when Christ used it; it has had notable success in our own time wherever it has been tried. It is that of direct personal influence extended to them on the footing of human sympathy and divine love, the latter implying—here as always—the use of severity in the right place.

tion approaches the ideal of charity organization exemplified by Dr. Chalmers, it is entitled to the respect and confidence of all thinking people. Voluntary associations at their best, however, are not equal to doing the work of a wisely directed church system, such as he was working. They lack contact generally with the highest principles involved in the work of helping men; they commonly shrink from evoking the highest motives in their appeals to them. They are too dependent on the enthusiasm of individuals, and too apt to harden and dry into something altogether alien to the purposes of their founders.

Besides, as the Puritans used to say, "the proper nurse for Moses is Moses' mother." The principle of charitable relief originated in the bosom of the Christian Church, and in that church it should find its best guardian and promoter. The united church of America will need no poorhouses and no relief societies.

The divided churches of America cannot be praised for showing either breadth or insight in their dealing with this problem. They generally care for the needy and the aged among their actual communicants, without feeling as churches any responsibility for those who are outside that line. Yet the first church of the Twelve gave to the poor

even from its poverty, as we happen to learn from two incidental notices (John 12 : 5, 6; 13 : 29), although its charities were carried on with the delicacy our Lord had enjoined. What is done beyond this is not always with wisdom. Take our Dorcas societies, for instance. They are far too often pauperizing agencies, to which people throng to obtain clothing for their children, on pretense of sending them to the congregational Sunday-school. I knew a woman in the southern end of Philadelphia, whose children were Episcopalians the first half of every winter and Presbyterians the second, so that she might get them two suits of clothes from the rival Dorcas Societies, although she was as able to clothe her children as I was to clothe mine. Peter recalled Dorcas to life, but I have my doubts of his doing that for a Dorcas Society! The harm done to the receivers of such gifts is far greater than the loss to the givers. Is it permitted to us to tempt brother or sister to sell their souls for bread or clothing?

Next to this unwisdom I put the unwisdom of barrack-building. The easiest way of dealing with the dependent classes, that which most relieves us of personal trouble, is to put up a big building, and gather them into it, and raise a fund to feed and clothe and warm them. It is charity by wholesale, and on the most economical terms. But is it

good for the human beings? Especially is it good for little children, to gather them by scores and hundreds into these barracks, in the very years of their life when some kind of personal interest in them is indispensable to their moral training—almost to their human existence? Can any one who believes that God made the family, and that its life is the only life fit to cherish the normal growth and happiness of a child, look at an orphan asylum as anything but a device to rid human beings of their responsibilities? I am not finding fault with the people in charge of these institutions. I only say that they are placed under demands for care, attention, and interest in the children, with which no human being could comply.

Institutional life is no life for a child in possession of its normal faculties, and there is not a particle of necessity that any child should be condemned to it. Our Children's Aid Societies, on the plan first devised by Mrs. Clara Leonards of Springfield, Mass., have shown that it is perfectly possible to provide for every orphan in the land by placing homeless or neglected children in real homes, where they will be cared for as individual persons, and not be subjected to the personal desolation of being lost in a crowd, and thus hardened into doing without the ties of natural sympathy. I am glad to say that

this method of providing for such children is now in operation in three-fourths of the counties of our state.

The maxim I have quoted from the Puritans, "The proper nurse for Moses is Moses' mother," might be applied with equal force to education. Our school and university systems are the creation of the Christian Church. It was not until the Christian Church fought and won the battle for education that the state and individuals discovered it was a thing of such excellence that money might well be spent on its endowment.

This is as true of America as of Europe, and the churches cannot be accused of any lack of interest in the higher education. Indeed, at times, the interest is too pressing, as when an area which could support one university decently is burdened with half a dozen denominational colleges, each starving the others. But in the matter of primary and intermediate education, most of our churches show far less interest, and they seem to have acquiesced in the complete secularization of our schools without so much as a protest. In New York it was none too soon for our own Synod to call attention to the elimination of religious and even ethical teaching from the curriculum of the public schools.

The relation of the church to the nation presents

many nice problems, which are not solved by assuming that the two forms of society constitute entirely separate spheres of life and activity. They are best kept distinct; they never can be made separate. A church made up of disembodied spirits might be separate from the state. But a church made of living men and women, who owe duties to the state, and who require a definite locality within its area for their assemblies and a home for their protection, is obliged to stand in another relation than that of separation. From the membership of the state the church obtains its membership. Under the laws of the state it owns its property. Through the legislation of the state it secures the weekly day of rest for its worship. Through the police of the state its solemn assemblies are strictly guarded from interference and interruption. By the prohibition of the state it is protected against the offense of public blasphemy.

And the state is as unable to ignore the church as is the church to ignore the state. To put it at the lowest, the church is a mainstay of the social order, a chief pillar of the state, and not least so when there is no direct attempt to control political issues to church ends. So well is this recognized that men who have no distinct Christian faith of their own do yet contribute to the building and

support of the churches on purely social grounds. An infidel newspaper complains that this is true even of those who agree with it. Perhaps they are influenced by the consideration Dr. Bushnell used with a rich man of that way of thinking, when he was collecting money for a new church in Hartford. To a blunt refusal he replied: "My friend, I want you to think of something. What was real estate worth in Sodom?"

But the church has a higher function than to supplement the police force, as our public men seemed to think of her a century ago. In relation to the nation itself, to its standing with its sister nations, and to the diverse classes and contending interests within the nation, the church's work is to act at once as a moral tonic and a mediator between opposite parties. Nothing could be more unscriptural or more out of line with the history of our own church than the assertion that the church is so spiritual a body that it must altogether ignore whatever belongs to the social life and the political duties of the country. If that assumption be followed to its legitimate consequences, it will land us alongside the Plymouth Brethren, who make entire abstention from political life a condition of church membership. Not so the Scottish Kirk in her heroic days understood her rights and her duties. Her

General Assembly asserted her right "to treat in an ecclesiastical way of greatest and smallest affairs, from the king's throne, that should be established in righteousness, to the merchant's balance, that should be used in faithfulness." There is a great importance, however, in that phrase, "in an ecclesiastical way." It is a limitation of church action which the Kirk did not always respect.

The relation of the church to public and social questions must always be different from that of the state. If we take our Lord's own method and that of the apostolic church as our standard, we shall see that the direct discussion and attack of social evils, the dealing with the evil branches of an evil tree, is not "the ecclesiastical way." Rather, as John foretold of Christ, it is the church's work to lay the ax at the root of the tree, to imbue society with the great principles of right action, and to leave these to work themselves into better social methods. It was a right instinct which brought the young man to Christ to ask that he persuade his brother to give him his fair share of the inheritance. He felt that Christ had a sense of such wrongs, and was come to do away with them. Yet for the sake of thousands our Lord must not deal in this direct way with one case. He answers: "Who made me a judge or a divider over you?"

So he and his apostles dealt with such social wrongs as polygamy and slavery. They taught what made these things unendurable to an enlightened conscience, and they left the result to coming generations.

So will the church be wise to deal with our problems, not as having a cluster of ready-made solutions of those problems, but as put in trust with great principles which are to lead to their solution. It will decline to be made a judge or a divider, while it accepts in some degree that of a mediator, who has no sentence to pronounce, but a great law of love and brotherhood to proclaim to both parties. The position claimed for the papacy in the Middle Ages, and often exercised, is exactly that which our Master refused. It was an attempt to elevate the papal see to the rank of final arbiter in all controversies, with the right to invoke the temporal powers to enforce its decision. The manifold evils which resulted from that, stand as a warning to all churches that they should recognize their proper sphere and its limits, and leave the state to do its proper work.

In international relations, the church as a world-wide institution has a work to do for peace and righteousness, to which it never has seriously addressed itself. When have two Christian nations

been kept from war, or a Christian nation from unjust aggression, by any spiritual influence exerted by the church? To meet the need created by this neglect we have philanthropic organizations pressing on public attention impracticable schemes of international arbitration, or the abolition of war, which are calculated to do more harm than they would avert.

So, in relation to the domestic contests of political parties, the church has a mediatorial duty, which is equally neglected. It is not its duty to cast its weight on the side of either party, however strong the temptation at times to do so. The spirit of party is hostile in itself to the spirit of Christ. It is a spirit which is tolerant of but half the truth, while Christ demands openness to all truth. It is a spirit which throws men into antagonism with each other, while he comes to turn their hearts to each other. Therefore, all parties of his day hated Christ as their common enemy, and laid aside their quarrels for a time to work together for his destruction. It is a spirit which scatters where Christ is gathering. The duty, therefore, of a Christian, may be to act with the party whose half of the truth seems to him the most important for the present emergencies of the public life; but he should never allow himself to be absorbed by

the spirit of party. In fact, he never should *belong to* any party, because he should belong to the truth, to his country, to God.[1]

By reinforcing this higher view of duty, the church will do much to moderate the violence of party strife, without entering the political arena itself, and also without weakening or diminishing the public spirit of its members. It will remind

[1] Dr. Friedrich Fabri, the accomplished head of the Rhenish Mission Society, has discussed this admirably in a tract on "The Attitude of Christians towards Politics" ("*Die Stellung der Christen zur Politik.*" Barmen. 1863). He takes as his starting-point our Lord's saying that "every scribe who hath been made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old." Of this saying he remarks:

"It describes to us the twofoldness of every development, and shows us that all history, by a necessity of nature, constructs itself from a friction between these two factors, the new and the old. The application of the saying to politics is clear enough. All political struggles have their root in the variance of these two principles, a new which seeks to take shape beside an old that is already here; and, conversely, all sound historical development rests on the rightful and timely synthesis of a new which is seen to be inevitable with the old which has been tried and proved. The alignment of political parties also at all times is arranged of necessity according to the double principle which is expressed in that statement. There always has been a party which laid the sharpest stress on the old, and rejected the new with emphasis. When this tendency is dominant, conservatism (*restauration*) is the watchword. A condition of seeming stagnation, be it for a longer or a shorter time, then begins. But after this has reached its culmination, it has to give way to the steadily increasing pressure of the new, which now, frequently with violent commotions,

men that the things in which they agree are far greater than those as to which they are divided. Thus it may save us from sinking to the French level, at which any party would welcome a foreign invasion that would result in the overthrow of its political rivals. It will prepare the way for that better age when partisan methods of government, with their moral wastefulness and political inefficiency, will have been laid aside with other childish

declares war upon the old in more or less radical fashion. Every revolution is based upon a violently repressed or badly directed evolution. This fact, of course, by no means establishes a right of revolution. Every revolution, in the eyes of Christians, is rather a judgment of God, an occurrence of which it may be said: 'It must needs be that offenses come, but woe to him through whom they come.'. . . But it is clear that each of the two principles is false and hurtful to the general interest when it is given exclusive validity, for all that is coming to be has need of what is already established, and all that is established has need of a steady current of fresh growths. If we may venture to translate our Lord's saying into the speech of party politics, we may say that it corresponds to the principle of Liberal-Conservatism, the principle of the political mean (*mitte*). It contains, however, something vastly higher than this. It enunciates the fundamental law of all life and of all historical development, in a manner incomparably simple and profound."

Dr. Fabri writes with especial reference to the political situation in his own country, where the alliance of Lutheran orthodoxy with political toryism, on the principle of "the solidarity of the Conservative interests," has done great harm to religion by alienating the working classes from the church. He himself, Professor J. C. K. Hofman of Erlangen, and Dr. M. Baumgarten of Rostock, took a different course from this.

things of our imperfect development. In that better day it may be possible for us to grasp a truth as a whole, perceiving its many-sidedness.

So of the antagonisms of social classes, of rich and poor, of capitalist and laborer. The church is tempted alternately to side with each party to the great dispute which divides modern society. On the one side lie wealth, social influence, the command of the means to carry out great schemes for the promotion of the cause of Christianity; on the other lie the numbers for whose welfare the church itself exists, and whose indifference or hostility may seem likely to be overcome by a hearty partisanship for their interests and their wishes. It was the former temptation which prevailed a generation ago; it is the latter which is unbalancing many of the brightest spirits now. Each is equally a mistake, although the latter is the nobler mistake. Either will lead the church into the false position of being "judge and divider," whereas it has a different, and not less difficult, work to do. It has to proclaim the law of Christ to both, as the only solvent of our social difficulties. To the rich it must take the solemn warnings of its Master as to the spiritual dangers that beset riches. It has to show them the deadly perils of that greed of gain which threatens to eat out the spiritual life of this

land as it did that of Judea. It has to rebuke their treating or regarding any human being as a mere instrument to serve their convenience, and to demand that they enter into right and human relations with every one of those whom God brings into their lives or their service. It has to teach them of the responsibilities that attend the possession of wealth, of the temptations to rest in it as the substance of success for this world, and of the danger of valuing it at too high a rate in view of the certainty that as we brought nothing into this world, so we shall take nothing out of it.

To the poor the church has a mission equally important. It has to remind them that He who lived the perfect life chose the poor man's lot, had not where to lay his head; that he toiled at the humblest tasks until called away from them to preach the coming of the kingdom. It has to warn them against "the deceitfulness of riches" that are in the hands of other men, and that seem to constitute a happiness in life, to which only the few are admitted. It has to remind them that all this is the shallow and outward judgment of those who look on appearances, and that no real good in life is denied to the humblest condition, while many of the best are possible to it alone, such as the constant mutual helpfulness and kindly

service which are the monopoly almost of poor families and neighborhoods. It has to insist that this life is but the forecourt and the preparation for another, in which all equalities are redressed, and the rich man who found his good things in purple, fine linen, and sumptuous fare, will have reason to envy the poor man who had to do without them and to find his good things in another quarter. Well has Victor Hugo said that when Lazarus ceases to believe in that other and better life, he will cease to lie at the rich man's gate. Rather he will come in, and throw the rich man out of the window!

So in the face of the great industrial forces which fall into strife over the wages and the hours of labor, the church has to insist to both that power is only good if a man use it lawfully,—whether it be the power of wealth or the power of organization,—and that the highest social law is that of Christ: "Bear ye one another's burdens."

The conflict between the two forces grows out of a mutual distrust, rather than any economic or social necessity. Neither can engage in the work of production without the other. Both capital and labor are sterile until they come into co-operation. By the great law of distribution, pointed out by Carey, adopted by Bastiat, and defended by Atkin-

son, labor is so rewarded out of the joint product of the two forces that there is a tendency toward equality of condition among all classes. It gets a constantly increasing share of a constantly increasing product. Only a minority of workingmen, or of any class, save anything from their incomes; yet the money saved by the working people of America is estimated to exceed the entire capital invested in manufactures.

It is not, therefore, economic, but moral, evils that are the root of strife and bitterness between them. It is the indifference, the lack of personal consideration of the capitalist for the laborer, and the resentment and envy of the laborer toward the capitalist, which set them against each other, and which make a peaceful understanding at critical moments difficult or even impossible. The church's message to both is not one of partisanship for either, or even of the truths of political economy, but of exhortation to the peaceful mind which bears fruit in acts of peace. "Let there be no strife between you, for ye are brethren." Sympathy, personal friendship, love of man for man irrespective of social distinctions, are the cementing forces which will heal our divisions, as no devices like co-operation or profit-sharing ever will.

If the church is to fulfil its vocation in this re-

spect, it must be by becoming the place where rich and poor meet together on the common recognition of God as the Maker of them all. There must be a discouragement of that social ostentation in the sanctuary which makes the poorly dressed feel out of place there. There must be less of the special honor to the rich man in fine raiment, and with the gold ring, which the hard-headed, practical Apostle detected even in the church of the first days. The church founded by Christ among the poor has the constant tendency and temptation to become the church of the rich, just as every great movement in art began in the workshop of the artisan, but was corrupted when it was taken into the palaces of nobles and kings.

The Socialist retorts that the church began with all things held in common, and that this was the interpretation the apostles and their first converts put upon the plain words of Christ, which point to an equalization of condition as a feature of the right order of society. For my part, I find no such teaching in the Gospels. I do find that in a solitary case, and with reference to the spiritual needs of a man entangled in the love of riches, Christ bade him to divest himself of his wealth, and give it to the poor. I also find that he warned people against the snare that lies in riches. But I find that both

he and his apostles teach not an equalization of condition, but a stewardship of all possessions, material and immaterial, for the uses of the divine kingdom.

It was comparatively an easy task Christ set to the ruler (Luke 18 : 22), and that because he saw him unequal to the much greater task of administering his wealth for the highest ends. "Teach me to keep; 'tis easier far to give." It is far harder to hold an estate in trust for Christ than to bestow it at once on the needy. And the result even for the needy is much better. The rich men who were converted along with others at Pentecost suddenly found themselves face to face with an extent and depth of poverty in their new brethren they never had realized before. They did what was perfectly natural, when they poured their wealth into a common fund, that a fresh distribution might be made. It was not a communistic arrangement, but a redistribution on the basis of equality. The consequence, however, was social disaster. The poor are such generally because they have no gift to keep or increase their store. These in Jerusalem soon were as poor as before, and now there were no rich to assist them. So the church at Jerusalem became an object of charity, for which collections had to be taken up in other churches. That seems

to have been the first and the last experiment in communism the Apostolic Church made.

The church aims at nothing less than the realization of Christ's ideal of society as set forth especially in the Sermon on the Mount. That sermon deals with what is fundamental to the kingdom of God. They who act on its maxims are laying their foundation on the rock. They who only hear them, and fail to reduce them to practice, are laying their foundations on the sand, and are courting destruction and calamity. The elements of strength and of perpetuity in this land are not found in the wisdom of our constitutional arrangements, or the accumulation, or even the general distribution, of our wealth, or in the general diffusion of intelligence among the people, but in the unselfishness, the readiness for social sacrifices, the brotherliness and the neighborliness, of the people of the land. And the only foundation for these is in that "mind of the Father" which Christ discloses to us as at once the norm and standard of right social action, and the source of all power to act rightly. In so far as this pervades any society, the divine kingdom is come, the divine will is done, as in heaven, so on that piece of the earth.

For the society of earth joins to that of the life beyond. The church is the society which belongs

to both lives. It is the gathering under one Head of all that is in the heavens and all that is in the earth. It is the fellowship of all who hold by the Head, who love his appearing, and who are striving to depart from iniquity. Here it is the church militant, fighting not so much against the evil that is in the world without, as that which is in the hearts of its membership, in its own assemblies, its social relations; there, those who have wrestled with their own evil, the evil in their brethren, the evil of the world, enter that triumphant host of the white-robed army of the faithful witnesses (the *martyrum candidatus exercitus* of the *Te Deum*) to continue that warfare to the final triumph of the knightly King who sits upon the white horse.

All the Scripture expressions about that life to come represent it as a life of more perfect and intimate association of man with man than this. It is an army, a kingdom, a holy city, an ordered host of concordant singers. "I go to a world of order," said the dying Hooker, who gave his life to expounding the divine order in the church on earth. And order is complete there, because self has ceased to dominate and disorder the spirits of men. No selfish or isolated immortality is the Christian's final rest, but a share in the life of the one body received from the one Head.

The life beyond death is organic life. We shall not stand in equal and indifferent relation to all we find there. There will be personal ties as close, as intimate, as fruitful of personal inspirations to good, as we knew here; but the center of all will be Christ. Those we learned to love here with the unselfishness of the kingdom, whether by the grand inspiration of friendship, or the slow discipline of life's social relationships, will be as near and dear there. But the one Friend will be the master of our joys, the supreme inspiration of relations, the central sun of the spiritual heavens. There all that earth predicted in the measure of love attained will be realized in the perfect social state.

Has not the vision of this been molding the fellowships of earth? I have been greatly impressed with the hold the Scripture revelations of heaven took upon our forefathers in the first generations after their conversion to the Christian faith. Those were rough and barbarous ages still, for Christian principle was slow in penetrating to social relations. But from the confusions of earth they turned to the order, the peace, the unbroken joy, of the land beyond the grave.

INDEX.

INDEX.

AGNOSTICISM: in sociology, 16-22; its theory of the state, 128-133.
America: hasty marriages, 27; lax divorce laws, 59-61; lax family discipline, 73-75; its history parallel with the Jewish, 101, 102; over-faith in constitutions, 126, 127, 134 ff.; slavery, 135; protection denied its citizens, 136, 137; honesty in business, 143; "country of least happiness," 152; Sunday laws, 155; colleges fostered by the church, 169, 170, 250; common schools, 171; divided churches, 173; not a secularist country, 156, 173, 175-177, 180, 185, 186, 187; education of immigrants, 171, 193, 194; imported sects, 209; their polemics, 210-213; signs of church reunion, 233, 234; charity organization, 240, 242, 248-250.
Aquinas, Thomas, 177.
Aristotle, 87, 91, 112.
Atkinson, Edward, 260, 261.
Augustine, 48.

BAADER, Franz, 98.
Baal and his significance, 125, 126.
Baeda, 164, 165 *n.*
Baptism: its meaning, 68, 69, 217.
Baring-Gould, Sabine, 220.
Bascom, Dr. John, 187.
Beecher, Lyman, 208.
Benedict of Nursia, 163.
Beth-ha-Midrash, 160, 161, 222, 223.
Bible a sociological book, the, 6-8; a book for children, 70; a family book, 83; honored by the Reformation, 166, 167; a book for schools, 174, 181, 182, 187-189.
Bishops, American house of, 233, 234.
Boucher, Philip, 146.
Brooke, Henry, 201, 202.
Brothers and sisters, 80, 81.
Buddhism: its "charities," 235.
Bushnell, Horace, 252.
Business life, its sins and temptations, 143, 144.

CALVINISM is theocratic, 12-14, 252, 253.
Capital and labor at strife, 149-152, 258-262.
Carey, Henry C., 11, 260.
Celibacy may be a duty, 25, 26; of the clergy, 49, 50, 53.
Chalmers, Dr. Thomas, 242-246, 247.
Charity organization societies, 242.
Charles the Great, 163.
Childhood in literature, 69-71.
Children's aid societies, 249, 250.
China the Agnostic state, 133; it anticipates Henry George, 139.
Chivalry and woman, 51, 52.

Christ and Socialism, 2, 4, 142; his incarnation, 19, 215, 219; his passion, 200; preaches the kingdom of heaven, 7, 9; the gatherer of humanity, 11, 12, 255; his headship, 14, 199, 200, 201, 205; the peace-bringer, 151; the true center for the soul, 201, 202; on primeval marriage, 28, 29, 31; on the family, 41, 42, 46; on the *lex talionis*, 108; his social law, 148; his dealing with social problems, 252, 253; teaching as to care of the poor, 237-239; lived the poor man's life, 259.
"Christian Socialists," 142.
Christocentric life, 202; sects, 215, 217.
Church: its place in sociology, 15, 195, 196; the institute of humanity, 195-200; highest form of society, 231; not co-extensive with the kingdom of God, 106, 232; an end in itself, 200; a spiritual organism, 200; the normal laws of its order, 233; is both visible and invisible, 202-205; its threefold life, 217; its social functions, 219 ff.; 231 ff.; distinguished from a sect, 211, 212; its worship of God, 219-223; the Bride of Christ, 44-46; its division a grave evil, 204-209; means to its unity, 217, 218, 233, 234; its work abandoned to associations, 226-230; woman's place in its work, 223-226.
——— Its starting-point the Jewish nation, 100, 195, 196; confounded at first with the state, 104; its methods in the apostolic age, 161, 162, 222, 223, 226; its martyr heroines, 47; its lapse from the true idea of the family, 47-51.
Church: its relations to the family, 81-83; to the state, 250-255; to the care of the poor, 223, 224, 234-250; to political parties, 255-258; to industrial antagonisms, 152, 153, 260, 261; to the school, 171-174, 250; to the Sabbath, 79, 80.
City: the first form of the state, 112, 113; in Judea, 114, 115; in New Testament use, 115, 116.
Cobden, Richard, 198.
Coleridge, S.T., 30, 54 *n.*, 74, 93, 217.
Columella, 37.
Colwell, Stephen, 11.
Communism: of the family, 61, 92; carried over to the tribe, 92, 93; compared with Socialism, 142; not adopted at Pentecost, 263.
Compulsory education, 191-193.
Confessional, 83, 84.
Conscience: agnostic theory of, 22, 128, 129; the guarantee of equality and of liberty, 127, 134-137.
Constitutions: excessive trust in, 126, 127; they must not contravene the divine law of society, 134-137.
Covenanters: as witnesses for the kingdom, 14, 15; their "testimony-bearing" sermons, 207 *n.*
Covetousness, 100, 101, 147-149, 152, 153, 157, 158.

DARWIN, Charles, 4, 30, 66.
David, 96-97.
Deacons and deaconnesses, 224-226.
Degeneracy, human, 17, 29, 30.
Discipline of the family, 71-76.
Divorce, 2; conceded by Moses, 31; among the later Jews, 32, 34; among the early Christians, 42; in Rome, 39; in Japan, 58; in America, 59, 60.

Döllinger, Dr. Ignaz, 164, 165.
Dorcas societies, 248.
Drummond, Professor Henry, 9, 208.

Ecclesiasticism, 105, 106.
Education: of children by parents, 76-80, 159, 160; once furnished by work, 154; among the Jews, 159-161; compulsory education, 191-193; education of immigrants, 193, 194.
Eight-hour day for labor, 153-155.
Eliot, George, 34, 124, 141.
Emerson, R. W., 16, 178.
Empire, the: its place in sociology, 15; its reason for existence, 196, 197; its immorality, 211.
England: her clerical families, 54, 55 *n.*, 55; her Parliament, 119; her courts, 120, 121; teaches the Irish no history, 184; her workhouse system, 240, 241, 243; forces this on Ireland, 247.
Environment, exaggeration of its influence, 3, 4, 144, 145.
Evolution a sociological theory, 15.

Fabri, Dr. Friedrich, 256, 257 *n.*
Family's place in Sociology, 15, 23-26; it is the institute of the affections, 23-28, 57-59; its life in Judea, 33, 159, 160; among the later Jews, 34; among early Christians, 41-47; among Protestants, 53-56; its rights denied by Agnosticism, 132; its ownership of a home, 140-141.
Father and child, 63-69.
Fatherhood of God, 67-69.
"Flesh" not the body, 49.
Fourierism and marriage, 60.
Foustel de Coulanges, 84, 113.
Francis of Assisi, 153, 228.
Franklin, Benjamin, 95, 109.
Freedom, human, 16, 17.
Friendship, 59.

Germany: Sunday demanded by workers, 156, 157; education in Luther's time, 166, 167; its reunion, 203, 204; political parties and the church, 256, 257 *n.*
God: revealed in social relations, 9, 10, 64; his sovranty, 12, 13; the unseen King, 14, 102, 105; works through men, 18; the sun of the social system, 18, 19; love to God taught by love of men, 24; his fatherhood, 67-69, 72-75, 76, 77; he is sought in the oath, 110, 111; nation in covenant with him, 111, 112; his rule from a throne, 125-128; gathers mankind to Christ, 199, 200, 205, 231; how he gives to us, 237-238.

Hamerton, Philip G., 77.
Hebrews (see Jews).
Hegel, G. F. W., 94, 197.
Helps, Sir Arthur, 25.
Heredity, 63-67.
Hooker, Richard, 265.
Hugo, Victor, 71, 260.
Huxley, Professor Thomas H., 16, 70, 186, 187.

Ignatius of Antioch, 234.
India: the village community, 90, 91; the land system, 139.
Individualism: the age of, 8; reaction against it, 8-12; its great services, 146, 232, 233.
Infanticide forbidden by Moses, 33, 34; and by Mohammed, 35; in Greece and Rome, 40, 41; in China, 41.
Italy, its reunion in 1859-1871, 204.

Janet, Paul, 75, 76.

Japan: divorce in, 58 *n.*; Christian unity, 208, 209.
Jesuits, 167, 168.
Jewish nation: a type, 6, 101, 102; prophets, 6, 7, 64-67, 97-100, 196; law, 28, 31, 106-111; divorce, 31, 32; women, 32, 33; family, 33, 34, 84; tribe, 95-97; captivity, 99, 100; theocracy, 101-106; punishments, 107-110; national covenant, 111, 112.
Johnson, Dr. Samuel, 145.
Judiciary: among Jews, 95, 96; 109, 110; among Greeks and Romans, 111, 114; modern, national and local, 120, 121.

KINGDOM of heaven proclaimed by John the Baptist and Christ, 7.

LAND: owned by the nation, 138, 139; Mosaic and other ancient land laws, 33, 114, 116, 120, 140; the "nationalization" of land proposed, 139-141.
Lecky, W. H. H., 54, 55 *n.*
Lessing, G. E., 54, 197.
Lex talionis, 108, 114, 138.
Liberty based on faith, 126-128; imperiled by Agnosticism, 22, 128-133.
Luther, Dr. Martin, 52-54, 71, 166, 167, 228, 129.

MAINE, Sir H. S., 93.
Manse, sons of the, 53, 54.
Marriage: how constituted, 24, 136; not the calling of all, 25, 26; to be undertaken deliberately, 26, 27; a slow process, 27, 28; monogamous from the first, 29-31; its spiritual significance, 44-46.
Masonic order, 197, 198.
Maurice, F. D., 13, 124, 162 *n.*
Mazzini, Giuseppe, 123.
Methodism and the family, 80, 82.
Mill, J. S., 6, 7, 94, 98.
Monasticism, 48, 49, 50, 51; Luther on it, 52, 53; no solution of the problem of property, 153; its degeneracy and "reformations," 228, 229.
Moody, Dwight L., 10.
Moslem family life, 34; Sufism, 35; schools, 179, 180; almsgiving, 235, 236.
Mulford, Elisha, 21, 121.

NATION: its place in sociology, 15, 135, 136; the creation of God, 20, 21; the institute of rights, 88-90, 133, 240; "a people with the will to be one," 123, 203; each has its theology, 179-181; the Christian nation, 20, 21, 134; the Agnostic theory of the nation, 22, 128-133; the commandments given to a nation, 156; its Sabbath laws, 155-158; its relations to the church, 250 ff.; its relation to theocracy, 102-107; "in covenant with God," 111, 112; its authority reinforced by public conscience, 134-137; owes protection to all its people, 136, 137; it realizes the right of property, 137-149; its right to regulate labor, 155; cannot administer charity successfully, 240-247.
——— Contains the process of history, 121, 122; anticipated in the tribe, 91-93; under a law of progress, 93, 94; typified by the Jews, 94-102; has its sacraments, 123-125, 203, 204; symbolized by the Hebrew throne, 125-127; developed by Teutonic representation, 116-120; acquires judicial power, 120, 121.
Newman, Dr. J. H., 237.

Nicolaus of Strasburg, 222 *n.*
Niebuhr, B. G., 38, 140.

ORPHAN asylums, 248-250.

Pagus and *Pagani*, 112, 115, 116.
Parker, Theodore, 27, 28.
Parties and their influence, 255-258, 206, 207.
Patria potestas: not in Judea, 33; in Rome, 37, 38.
Patricentric sects, 214, 215.
Paul: on the Christian family, 43-45, 63; on Christian charity, 239, 245.
Peabody, Elizabeth, 178, 179 *n.*
Persecution: justified by Atheism and Agnosticism, 129-131; practiced illogically by Theists, 131.
Pliny, the younger, 225.
Pneumatocentric sects, 216.
Political economy: modern, 3, 10, 11; Carey's law of distribution, 260, 261.
Polygamy of two kinds, 29; an innovation, 30; tolerated by Moses, 31; dies out among the Jews, 31, 32; sanctioned by Mohammed, 34; impossible to Christians, 44.
Poor, church care of, 223, 224, 234 ff.; among Buddhists, 235; among Moslems, 235, 236; in some Roman Catholic countries, 236, 237; the Christian ideal, 237-239; in the early church, 239; in England since 1601, 240, 241; in the hands of the state, 240, 246, 247; Chalmers's work, 242-246.
Progress in Jewish nation, 6, 7, 31, 32, 94, 95, 98, 99; the nation progressive, 93, 94.
Property, right of, 2, 90, 91, 137 ff.
Prophets and their social teachings, the, 6, 65, 66, 97-100, 196.
Puritans and the family in church, 82.

QUARLES, Richard, 152.
Quinet, Edgar, 239.

REFORMATION in sociology, 13; honored the family, 52-56, 83; affects education, 166-169; its "common prayer," 221.
Reformed Church, 12-14, 167, 170, 229, 252, 253.
Representation: unknown to ancient politics, 116, 117; begins among the Teutons, 117-119; based on loyalty, 118-120.
Richter, Jean Paul, 12, 54, 172.
Rights, natural, 88-91.
Robertson, F. W., 222.
Roman Catholics and the Bible in the schools, 187-189; worship, 220, 221; alms-giving, 236, 237; monasticism, 228-230.
Rome: its family life, 36-39; law, 111, 113, 114, 116; "civilization," 112, 115; empire, 196 197, 239.
Ruskin, John, 70.

SABBATH and the family, 79, 80; a boon to labor, 156-158.
Salvianus, 39.
Savigny, F. K. von, 37, 38.
School: in Agnostic hands, the, 132; its history in antiquity, 159-163; in the middle ages, 163-166; in modern Europe, 166-168; in America, 169-171; church or state schools? 171-174, 250; Christian or secularist schools? 174-187; the Bible in the school, 187-191; compulsory attendance unwise, 191-193.
Scotland: parish care of the poor, 242-246; the Kirk on her rights, 252, 253.

Sects: defined, 211, 212; they stand in the way of Christian sympathy, 205, 206; they hinder the truth, 206-208; they retard progress, 208, 209; ours mostly imported, 209; their narrowing influence is decaying, 209-211; their threefold classification, 213-217.
Secularism, 105, 106, 174-182.
Seeley, Professor, 78, 79.
Sermon on the Mount, 7, 41.
Shakespeare, William, 62, 71.
Sin the breaker of the race, 98, 99.
Sisterhoods, 226.
Slavery in America, 135; in the New Testament, 254.
Smyth, Professor Newman, 158.
"Social contract," 85, 87-89.
Socialism: its demands, 2, 141, 142, 152; quotes the Bible, 5, 142, 262, 263; its criticism of modern society, 141-147; it underestimates the evil in man, 144, 145; it is opposed to freedom, 146; it has its uses, 146-149; implied in the almshouse, 240, 241.
Socrates, 129.
Sovranty of God, 12, 13, 214.
Spartan austerity, 36.
Spencer, Herbert, 30, 66.
Spenser, Edmund, 52.
Sterry, Peter, 218.
Sunday-school and religious education, 189-191.

TACITUS, 39.
Tennyson, Alfred Lord, 4, 5, 12, 54, 93, 146, 198.
Teutonic family life, 39, 116; respect for the Old Testament, 106; tribal life and law, 116; representation, 116-120.
Thackeray, William M., 51, 54.
Theocracy defined, 12, 102-106.
Trades unions and strikes, 150, 151.
Tribe's place: in sociology, 15, 85, 86, 91-97; in Hebrew history, 95, 97.
Trumbull, Dr. H. Clay, 59 *n.*, 73 *n.*, 161 *n.*, 222, 223.

UNIVERSITIES: in Europe, 165, 166; in America, 169-171.

VICO, G. B., 18, 133.
Voltaire, 106, 124, 168.

WESLEY, John, 8, 53, 82, 232, 233.
Whately, Archbishop Richard, 224, 237.
Woman: first honored for unwomanliness, 31; her position among the Hebrews, 32-34; among the Moslems, 34, 35; among the Greeks, 35, 36; among the Romans, 36-39; among the Teutons, 39, 40; among Christians, 41 ff.; her separate property, 60, 61; her social function, 61, 62; subordinate to her husband, 61-63; her place in the church's work, 223-226.
Wordsworth, William, 70, 71, 81.
Worship: in the family, 55, 83, 84; in the church, 219-223; in the state, 111, 156, 175, 176.

WEST[illegible]RARY

[redacted]
215872
REMOTE HN 31 .145 1891 / De civitate Dei. The divine order of

17576

HN
31
.T45

Thompson, Robert Ellis.
The Divine order of human society

Vassar College Library
215972
REMOTE [illegible] / De civitate Dei. The divine order of